HOW TO SAY YES IN LATIN:

A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF POSITIVE RESPONSE STRATEGIES IN ROMAN COMEDY

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University College London

Tomaž Potočnik

UCL

2024

Declaration

I, Tomaž Potočnik, confirm that the work presented in my thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Abstract

This thesis studies the positive response system in Latin as reflected in Roman comedy. Its aim is to systematise and describe the various positive response strategies which were available to the speakers of Latin at the time and to determine their division of labour and pragmatic underpinnings. After a preliminary discussion of the sources and previous treatments of positive response strategies in Latin in Chapter 2, Chapter 3 develops a framework for studying the echo response—the way of providing a positive response by repeating a part of the utterance in question—and non-echo response strategies—where a new word is introduced to confirm— in a systematic and transparent manner. The main analytic chapters—chapters 4 and 5—then analyse the echo response and selected non-echo responses based on this framework. The analysis proceeds from quantitative data, which are intended to discover trends, to detailed discussions of relevant categories, which are meant to formulate pragmatic reasons for the choice of one positive response strategy over another. The last analytic chapter— Chapter 6— introduces social factors and studies correlations between the social status of the speaker and the positive response strategy used. The conclusion discusses the importance of results for future studies in Latin linguistics and linguistics in general and briefly discusses the Latin positive response system within the European linguistic area.

Impact Statement

Apart from improving understanding of Latin as a language system, my thesis can be seen as a case study in using Roman comedy, a literary artifact, in linguistics. While in Classics there often exists a certain divide between linguistic and literary methods, my results can encourage development of more unified approaches to sources, instead of opting for one approach or the other. The combination of approaches can enhance results for both literary and linguistic questions.

My pragmatically oriented approach to studying the concept of an answer, which eludes description, because it is not morphosyntactically marked—an answer is only an answer with reference to what comes before it, otherwise it is just a sentence—can be used in other linguistic studies, not limited to Latin. In order to improve the usefulness of my thesis in other disciplines of linguistics, I attempted to outline my results in such a way that they can be put side by side with similar results in other languages. In this way, they can serve as input in such disciplines as linguistic typology.

Since it studies the impact of social and situational factors on the mechanics of conversation, my thesis can be useful outside the disciplines of Classics and linguistic, such as in sociological approaches to conversation. Indeed, an important part of my method for studying conversation traces its origins to sociology. By studying the impact of social factors, such as social status and politeness, on conversation in Latin, the thesis contributes to the general understanding of the conversation as a social phenomenon and the building block of society.

While the modern languages are taught with an interactive approach, the fact that Latin is only known from historical documents, might discourage teachers from approaching it in the same, interaction-based way. Since my thesis studies the workings of such basic conversational elements as providing a response to a question, it helps to dispel the myth of Latin as a collection of rules of grammar. It can thereby encourage more students to take up Latin and thus raise the profile of this language and of the associated scholarly disciplines in the long term.

By shedding light on the creative potential of the Latin conversation in comedy, my thesis can encourage creative reworkings of the theatre of Plautus and Terence, both of whom exercised a great influence on the European theatre.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

In studying any modern language, the basic conversational phrases for establishing rapport with someone are the first elements of language the student acquires. Chances are that one knows how to say *yes* and *no*, even *please*, in a language one does not really speak. This is not the case for Latin. While it is not expected for a non-linguist to know these words in a dead language, even trained Classicists can sometimes find it easier to give elaborate answers on complex grammatical questions than say *yes* or *please* in Latin.

Regarding *please*, excellent work has been done recently by Dickey (2012 and 2015). The Latin word for no—*non*—seems to be somewhat less problematic, partly due to its presence in our collective vocabularies through borrowing from Latin, directly or through proxy, e.g., *persona non grata* or *non sequitur*. It even seems to have achieved some level of productivity, as in 'I believe this is a *non*-issue.'[1]

Yes, on the other hand, seems to be more elusive to the general consciousness and even the consciousness of Classicists. This can partly be explained by the lack of dialogic sources in Classical Latin. In correspondence, Cicero found himself in a position where he had to say *please*. The word for *no* is also reflected in the corpus because of its role in negation. To negate a proposition in Latin (and many other languages) one puts *non* in front of it. However, there is no *a priori* reason why one would put a *yes* in front of a proposition[2] because the proposition is considered true as soon as it is uttered, unless otherwise stated. *Yes* has no obvious place in correspondence either. If our correspondent asks us a question in a letter, it would be unusual and odd to send back a sheet of paper with only the word *yes* on it, doubtless because the addressee would not find it informative—they would not know what the *yes* refers to without having remembered the question; in case of several questions asked, the correct interpretation would be virtually impossible. The respondent, aware of the inconvenience this would cause the addressee—and, subconsciously, of the potential for a communication breakdown—would intuitively opt for a more descriptive response.

---

[1] See Ferri (2012) for a treatment of negative responses in Latin from the perspective of politeness theory.
[2] By which I do not mean preceding an utterance with a proposition to strengthen it, as is possible in some languages, such as Spanish (*yo sí tengo* 'of course I have…'). In English (and Dutch, Pinkster 1972: 139) this is not possible.

If, for instance, invited by a letter to spend Christmas together, one is likely to write: 'We would be glad to spend Christmas together'. If an invitation were delivered in conversation, however, *yes* would be perfectly acceptable:

(1) Speaker 1: Are you coming to the party?
    Speaker 2: Yes. (invented)[3]

It is intuitively clear that Speaker 1 would have no trouble deciding what *yes* refers to. Since in both cases, in the correspondence scenario above and in the scenario in (1), the antecedent is a question which invites a *yes*/*no* response, we must conclude, at this stage, that the reason why the distant addressee would have trouble decoding *yes* is the distance. *Yes* only works if it immediately or almost immediately follows the question.

Outside Classical Latin, in Roman comedy, we find a lot of dialogic sources. These, however, are obviously not transcripts of Latin conversations, so *yes* is not necessarily going to resurface, because it is always possible or, as it turns out, even desirable to opt for something else. Thesleff, in the only systematic attempt to study *yes* and *no* in Latin before Potočnik (2023), claims that not using *yes* and *no* 'may add to the aesthetic qualities of a language' (Thesleff 1960: 5). Beach seems to have held the same opinion, speaking disparagingly of 'yes, that word now used on the radio as an affirmative of nothing in particular' (Beach 1955: 356). While I have not found similar judgements expressed in antiquity concerning Latin, such judgements could very well have played a part in the writers' opting for 'longer' ways of expressing confirmation. Whatever the case, the long-standing *communis opinio* regarding *yes* in Latin was succinctly expressed by Meillet in a lecture to the Five Academies, on 24 October 1925 (also quoted in Potočnik 2023):

> *Pourtant ce mot* [sc. yes] *n'est ancien nulle part ; le latin n'avait rien de pareil ; le grec non plus. Chaque langue romane a dû se donner un mot « oui » par ses propres moyens ; aussi le oui du français n'a-t-il rien de commun avec le si des Italiens ou des Espagnols. Un mot pour « oui » ne figurait pas parmi ceux que les peuples de langue indoeuropéenne ont reçus de la langue d'où sortent nos idiomes européens.*

> 'Yet, this word [sc. yes] is in no way ancient; Latin had nothing similar; Greek neither. Every Romance language had to give itself a word for "yes" through its own means. Thus,

---

[3] Throughout this study, I shall, following Thesleff (1960: 6), refer to the question—or anything else which can trigger a *yes*—as an *antecedent*. In discussing examples, I shall refer to the utterer of the antecedent as *Speaker 1* and the respondent as *Speaker 2*. I shall avoid the standard '*speaker—addressee*' notation because I am interested in responses and discussing responses by the addressee would result in an unnecessary confusion. Additionally, in many cases, a response in question will be given in a third communicative move, that is, by the first speaker, in which case the '*speaker—addressee*' notation breaks down.

oui in French has nothing in common with si of the Italians or the Spanish. A word for "yes" was not among those which the speakers of Indo-European languages received from the language that gave rise to our European tongues.' (Meillet 1936: 36; my translation)

In this passage, Meillet offers three significant observations:

- Latin had nothing similar (*pareil*) to the word *yes*;
- the Romance words for *yes* have nothing in common with each other;
- there was no such thing as *yes* in Proto-Indo-European either.

As discussed in Potočnik (2023: 86), there seems to be some consensus among Indo-Europeanists that the positive response might have been given by other means. Pokorny (1927: 237–8) writes that in Indo-European a positive response might have been given in the form of a sentence, even if a shortened one. This view is shared by Brown *et al.* (2009: 515) who suggest that 'the echo response' might be an Indo-European feature, if one reads the Celtic responsive form as the Proto-Indo-European use of injunctive.[4]

While on the surface the Romance words for *yes* might actually not have anything in common with each other, the linguistic substances which provided the words for *yes* have at least some things in common, such as the fact that in many cases the words which morphed into *yes* contained a deictic or an anaphoric element (see also Potočnik 2023: 87).

In this study I would like to challenge Meillet's view with a hypothesis, that even if there was a *yes*-word in Latin, we would not necessarily know it due to the nature of *yes*, briefly discussed above; due to the (possible) attitudes towards *yes* by the writers of Latin and potentially those who transmitted the texts to us; and the nature of the evidence available to us.

1.1 Aim of the study

While the attitude towards *yes* in Latin and beyond might be a productive vein of research at another stage (provided that appropriate sources are discovered), in this work, I will (in contrast to previous studies; see Section 2.1 of Chapter 2) systematically study the pragmatic and cognitive underpinnings of positive responses in Latin. I will anchor the theoretical framework for studying the Latin positive response strategies in modern studies. This approach should make it possible not only to compare the positive response system in Latin to that of modern languages, but also to offer insights into the Latin system which are otherwise not accessible

---

[4] See also Joseph (2003); Watkins (1963, 1969).

due to the nature of the sources. In theory, this should allow one to make conclusions, not limited to the surface forms attested in the sources.

The corpus of Plautus and Terence is sizeable enough (see Section 2.2 of Chapter 2) to take a quantitative approach, which should indicate general trends. This approach will be followed by a close analysis of examples in order to identify pragmatic factors for the trends identified and to discuss statistical outliers.

Throughout the study, the diachronic aspects of the positive response strategies will be kept in mind in order to place the state of affairs in Latin within the context of the European linguistic area[5] and to understand the relationship between the individual positive response strategies.

I will attempt to answer the following questions:

- How did Romans of the end of the 3rd and 2nd century BCE express confirmation or agreement?
- Was there such a word as *yes* in Latin?[6]
- What was the division of labour between different positive response strategies?[7]
- What are the interactive functions of *yes*-responses in Latin?
- What pragmatic factors are they governed by?

As will emerge throughout this study, the question of saying *yes* is much broader than the word *yes*, and, in fact, broader than the very concept of confirmation.

1.2   Contents of the study

Chapter 2 prepares the ground with a short review of previous efforts to study *yes* in Latin; it reviews some possible sources and the corpus used for this study; it briefly discusses the nature of the results we might expect from the study and their applicability. By discussing the problems of collection and categorisation, the concept of 'saying yes' is introduced in more detail and a categorisation of positive responses encountered in the corpus offered. Finally, the object of the study is narrowed down.

---

[5] European linguistic area as understood by Haspelmath (2001: 1492)—a *Sprachbund* comprising languages on the European continent: Romance, Germanic, Balto-Slavic, Balkan languages, and Finno-Ugrian languages.
[6] See Section 2.1 of Chapter 2 for previous attempts.
[7] While this question was addressed to some extent in Potočnik (2023), this study is wider in scope as well as more detailed.

In light of the diversity of form and function of positive responses encountered in Chapter 2, Chapter 3 develops a framework—heuristics—for studying the positive response system in Latin; this framework is anchored in existing studies on positive responses in modern languages.

Chapter 4, the first of the analytic chapters, studies the echo response based on the heuristics developed for the echo response in Chapter 3. Special attention is paid to pragmatic factors.

Chapter 5 studies selected non-echo responses based on the heuristics developed for the non-echo responses in Chapter 3.

Chapter 6 introduces social factors and studies possible correlations between the social status of the speaker and the positive response strategy used.

Chapter 7 offers conclusions. It discusses the import of results for future studies in Latin linguistics and linguistics in general and briefly discusses the Latin positive response system within the European linguistic area.

2   Preliminary Observations

2.1   Treatment of positive response strategies in Latin grammars and previous studies

In Latin grammars, the positive response strategies seem to be treated in two ways. They are included in sections on adverbs, such as modal adverbs, or adverbs of manner (see below). That is presumably because the function of a positive response in Latin seems to be frequently filled by an emphatic or intensifying adverb, such as *oppido*, *certe*, *maxume*, *admodum*, etc. These adverbs, however, are not the equivalents of *yes*-words, but rather equivalents of such expressions as *certainly*, that is, emphatic expressions. As will be substantiated throughout this study, these do not qualify as *yes*-words, because they convey more than the positive response.

The other option is a special subsection on positive responses. In this case, it seems that this subsection is mostly intended as a complement to a morphosyntactic discussion on questions. The section on responses is much shorter, confirming the common observation in literature regarding the relative neglect of responses (Jones 1999: 1, Holmberg 2016: 11, Brown *et al.* 2009: 489) as compared to the treatment of questions. A similar imbalance can be observed in the rate between positive and negative responses treated in scholarship. Both observations hold cross-linguistically, but especially for Latin. This can be explained by several factors, such as:

- Responses are not a formally distinct sentence type, i.e., as opposed to questions, they have no overt markers (Brown *et al.* 2009: 489);
- A response is only a response in reference to a question, otherwise it is just a statement (Brown *et al.* 2009: 490); it is only upon the (still relatively recent) arrival of pragmatics that the notion of a response becomes a valid category of analysis;
- It is commonly observed in Latin grammars, as we will see below, that there is no special word for *yes* in Latin; since 'there is no special word', the words used in this function have been treated under different categories, such as adverbs of modality or manner;
- In the same vein, negation is formally marked by a negative adverb or a particle, whereas a positive response is, from the morpho-syntactic point of view, just a sentence.

A systematic comparison of Latin grammars in terms of the section on responses (its presence, absence, complexity, or size), might yield interesting results. Since this is not the place for such a comprehensive review, I shall limit myself to a more detailed discussion of only two of them, selected for their general importance: Kühner-Stegmann (1955), and the pedagogical grammar

of Allen and Greenough (1903), popular in the English-speaking world.[8]Kühner-Stegmann (1955, third edition) have a section on '*Modalitätsadverbien*', with separate sections (1) for '*Gewißheit, Versicherung, Bekräftigung, Beteuerung, Bejahung*' (pages 795–810), where adverbs such as confirmative *nē, profecto, sane, certe, quidem*, etc., are treated in some detail; (2) for *Ungewißheit* (pages 810–3), with *forsitan, fortasse*, etc.; and (3) for '*Verneinung*' (pages 813–28), with *non, haud,* and *ne*, as well as a lengthy discussion on negation.

More significantly, they have a section entitled '*Antwort mit Ja und Nein*' (pages 531–2). They observe that such a response is achieved either (1) by repeating a word on which the emphasis is placed—a negative response is achieved by adding *non* (*mit vorgesetztem non*); or (2) by adverbs—some of them already treated in paragraphs on *Gewißheit* (§142–146)—such as *sane, vero* (rarely *verum*), *scilicet*, but also by *admodum, omnino, certe, etiam, ita, ita vero, ita est* and similar (the negative response is again achieved by adding *non* to an adverb, e.g., *non ita*, or with a specialised *minime*). The section ends with a short note on *immo* with several examples.

First of all, as will be shown throughout this study, a fundamental distinction exists between the echo response and the positive response particles. This distinction surfaces on all levels of study, both in diachronic development of positive response strategies and in synchronic relationship between them. In this sense, Kühner-Stegmann's terminology and wording are noteworthy. While the title could be taken to indicate that only positive responses of the type *yes* and *no* are treated, this is not the case, since the first positive response strategy they mention is, rightfully, the echo response. However, the echo response is by definition not the *ja*-response. This conflation of the echo response and the responses realised by particles seems to reflect the popular conflation of expressions 'saying yes' and 'providing a positive response'. Thus, when asking their parent for permission, a child is not unlikely to reinforce their plea with 'Please, say yes,' even though the particle *yes* might not be expected to feature in the response—indeed, as will be shown in chapters 4 and 5, *yes*, at least in Latin, is not among the default responses to a *request for permission* at all. *Antwort mit Ja* in the title should therefore be understood as any positive response (except for actual particles of the type *ja* and *nein*), as

---

[8] While I had every intention to study in the same way another influential grammar, Hofmann and Szantyr (1965), it turns out that it contains no effort at discussing positive responses. While a separate section on positive responses is not necessarily expected, the absence of a section on modal adverbs or one on adverbs of manner is more surprising. This is partly due to the confusing terminology, which Pinkster (1972: 45–61) tries to clarify. The confused way of treating Latin conjunctions has been recognised by Kroon (1995) as well.

indicated by the wording of the two main definitions: *Ja durch Wiederholung des Wortes auf dem der Nachdruck liegt* and *Ja durch: sane* etc.

Secondly, while *ita* and *ita est* are mentioned, *sic* and its derivatives are conspicuously absent, even though they are clearly present in the corpus. Neither the nature of the evidence, nor the frequency of *sic*, nor its meaning seem to explain the absence:

- Both examples of *ita* in the grammar have been collected from Plautus and Terence where *sic* can be found as well, in the same type of context (*question—answer* or *negatively biased question—emphatic answer*);
- While in Plautus *sic* only occurs three times in positive responses—which is still more frequently than *etiam*, which is present—in Terence it occurs with a frequency comparable to that of *ita*;
- As will be discussed in Chapter 5, *sic* should in most cases be read emphatically, that is, not like *yes* or *ja*, but something like *of course*. However, the same applies to many uses of *ita* and almost all other responses mentioned in the section.

Kühner-Stegmann (1955) reflect well the dual approach referred to above with a treatment of emphatic adverbs among adverbs and with a small subsection on positive responses. It is clear, however, that the subsection '*Antwort mit Ja und Nein*' has been included as a complement to the treatment of questions rather than for the intrinsic interest or special nature of positive responses. This is evidenced by the lack of not only linguistic terminology (perhaps not yet common at the time), but even the non-specialist meta-language for talking about responses (which still applies today), and secondly, by the fact that expressions in it have been included in a non-transparent way, without regard to any differences between them. It is nevertheless a relatively thorough treatment of the Latin positive response repertoire.

Allen and Greenough (1903) have a section on particles (which they understand as an umbrella term for adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections). Unlike in Kühner-Stegmann (1955) (but like in Hofmann and Szantyr 1965), there is no special section on modal adverbs. *Ita*, *sic*, and *valde* appear in the subsection on 'Adverbs of Manner, Degree, or Cause' (page 129).

In the part on syntax, the section 'Questions' has a subsection 'Question and Answer' (page 208), where it is stated that that 'there is no one Latin word in common use meaning simply yes or no,' but that '[i]n answering a question *affirmatively*, the verb or some other emphatic

word is generally repeated; in answering *negatively*, the verb with *nōn* or a similar negative.' They add that 'an intensive or negative particle, a phrase or a clause is sometimes used to answer a direct question'. This second possibility is accompanied by many examples, first for *yes* and then for *no*, such as *vero*, *etiam*, *ita*, *non hercle vero*, but with no references to the specific authors. *Sic* is, again, absent. This is followed by some examples of exchanges from Cicero and Terence.

Since Allen and Greenough (1903) is a pedagogical grammar, one does not expect to find in it a discussion on the adverbs and particles on the level of Kühner-Stegmann (1955). They acknowledge that there are two ways of providing a positive response—by using a repetition or by using a particle. Within the second option, one encounters some adverbs, such as *sane* and *vero*, but not others, such as *oppido*; there is no attempt at a differentiation of the expressions included.

The state of affairs regarding positive response strategies in the Latin grammars reflects the need for a pragmatic approach to studying them in several ways. First of all, by the fact that positive response strategies in Latin are thought to be equivalent to intensifying or emphatic adverbs; secondly, by the fact that a response in general is not considered an analytic category (reflecting the state of affairs in linguistics at the time); and thirdly (as a consequence of the second point), by the lack of a unified terminology.

Another area of research where positive responses regularly surface is the search for spoken Latin. Hofmann (2003: 152–4), in a section on affirmation and negation, states that the 'strong' later development of positive response strategies (*Termini di affermazione e di negazione*) does not lend itself to observation in the Latin *Umgangssprache*, perhaps because from the beginning most diverse formulas became fixed in changing contexts, none of which would become dominant. However, as suggested in Chapter 1, the reason why one cannot observe the simple *yes* and *no* in Latin is, rather than fixedness or context-dependency of diverse attested expressions, the nature of the sources.

The author goes on to analyse the following positive response strategies: *verum*, *recte*, *certe*, *etiam*, *ita*, and *sic*. If one considers the fact that the list of positive response strategies attested in Latin is actually longer and that they have widely different frequencies of occurrence, the selection seems arbitrary, although it is perhaps intended to reflect the whole history of Latin, covering authors from Old to Late Latin. Unlike Kühner-Stegmann (1955), the author includes *sic* and also indicates its different shades of meaning, from a synonym of *admodum* and *oppido*

in Terence to an equivalent of *ita* and *etiam*. The examples are collected from authors spanning several centuries and are representative of several pragmatic functions; as a result, however, an actual attestation of *ita* as a positive response particle—*ita ita* (Petronius, *Satyrica* 25.1)—is cited side by side with an example where *ita* is merely a part of a fixed phrase—*continuo hic adero—ita quaeso* (Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 502). Examples such as these confirm the need for a pragmatic perspective in analysing positive response strategies.

Thesleff (1960) is, as mentioned in Chapter 1, the first systematic attempt to study positive responses in Latin. The study, just like the present one, is limited to Plautus and Terence, for the obvious reason that only Plautus and Terence provide us with extensive enough material for this type of study. On the other hand, unlike this one, Thesleff's study analyses both positive and negative responses; it has, additionally, a section on *immo*.

A theoretical introduction at the beginning offers useful observations of *yes* and *no*, such as the fact that in European languages such words tend to derive from 'substitute responses' (i.e., responses other than the echo response). On the other hand, the familiar lack of differentiation—resulting from the lack of a pragmatically-informed perspective—is again visible in that no real effort is made to see a difference between the emphatic adverbs, pronouns, and 'pronominal adverbs' (*ibid.* 9). While the cross-linguistic perspective is not systematic, it is regularly referred to. Another strength of the study is that it contains sections dedicated to expressions found in Greek.

The analytic part is very comprehensive, trying to record all positive (and negative) response strategies occurring in the corpus. While the diachronic component is not systematically studied, Thesleff pays a lot of attention to mechanisation and strengthening, which refer to ongoing language change. The categorisation is mostly formal and the antecedents—i.e., contexts of use—are referred to in the descriptive parts. There are many examples to support the descriptions.

While Thesleff's is a valuable study, it is purely descriptive and a product of the time when no attention was paid to pragmatic considerations. Limited attempts are made to extract the underlying system of use; at any rate, the typological comparison with positive response strategies in other languages is hardly possible.

Pinkster (1972: 135–43), in a chapter on adverbs which I came across after the completion of this study, offers, from a syntactician's point of view, some remarks on *yes* and *no* in Latin,

appealing mostly to Kühner-Stegmann's treatment. He also notes the division between those strategies that 'fit in with the construction of the remarks that elicit the comments or answers' and those which do not (*ibid.* 1972: 139). The observation that *ita* in an example from Cicero[9] is not a mere substitute for anything in the antecedent, leads him to define the following criteria to determine the equivalence of the word in question to English *yes* and *no*:

- 'The degree to which a word fits in with the construction of the expression it refers to and, similarly,
- the degree to which a word has a clear meaning without appealing to expressions in the context of which it might be a constituent, and thirdly,
- the degree of individual semantic aspect of a word' (*ibid.*; the wording is a direct quotation; I have arranged it into a list for ease of reference).

The first criterion refers to whether the word can be traced to anything in the antecedent, i.e., whether it echoes anything from it; the second, presumably, refers to the independence of *ita* from expressions, such as *ita dico* or *ita est* (see Section 5.2.1 of Chapter 5). The last criterion corresponds, in this study, to whether *ita* carries anything more than polarity. As will be shown in Section 3.2.2 of Chapter 3, his remarks correspond well with findings on positive responses from other languages.

Müller (1997: 191–201), in what is in many ways a pioneering pragmatic study on the language of Terence, dedicates a section to discussing positive responses. His discussion seems to be comprehensive, with many examples and attention paid to idiomatisation. Despite his otherwise pragmatic orientation, however, his study is largely descriptive with little attention paid to potential universal (or at least cross-linguistic) cognitive underpinnings of positive responses; additionally, no real effort is made to determine pragmatic differences between, for instance, one-word echo response and longer echo responses. While the author was, to my knowledge, the first to apply methods from Conversation Analysis to Roman comedy, he does not recognise the role of *ita* in turn-taking. However, as will be shown in Section 5.2.1 of Chapter 5, it is likely that *ita* was used in that role as well.

What the works discussed in this section have in common (with the welcome exception of Pinkster 1972) is that they are describing the 'surface' forms attested in the sources. This results

---

[9] '(indicat) gladiatores emptos esse Fausti simulatione ad caedem ac tumultum? 'ita prorsus; interpositi sunt gladiatores' ('these gladiators were purchased for murder and riot on a pretence that they were furnished for Faustus? 'Exactly so; gladiators were intruded''; Cic. *Sull.* 54)' (quoted from Pinkster 1972: 139–40).

in idiosyncratic categorisations and prevents any real conclusions regarding the state of affairs in spoken Latin. While Müller poses a question regarding Plautus and Terence and their relationship to the *sermo cottidianus* (Müller 1997: 192), he cannot offer any definite answers, knowing that the surface level in the corpus is not necessarily a faithful record of the state of affairs 'on the ground' in Rome of the 3rd and 2nd century BCE. The lack of regard for the cognitive and cross-linguistic perspective can, additionally, lead to erroneous conclusions that emphatic adverbs were used *in lieu* of positive response particles.

The most recent (albeit brief) overview of positive response strategies in Latin is given by Pinkster (2015: 370–8). It is focussed on exemplification, rather than a detailed discussion of positive response strategies. It follows Thesleff (1960) closely and, with the exception of implicit confirmation, identifies most of the strategies discussed here.

In Potočnik (2023), I roughly outlined the division of labour between the echo response and the alleged particles *ita* and *sic*. I observed that both *ita* and *sic* were limited to information antecedents, that is, to confirming information, whereas the echo response could be used anywhere. However, I only paid attention to bare *ita* and *sic* and their occurrences with *est*. Similarly, I paid no attention to different formal realisations of the echo response. I attempted to place the situation in Latin into the context of the European linguistic area.

In contrast to the studies above, here I will, as stated in Chapter 1, describe some pragmatic and cognitive underpinnings of positive responses in Latin. I will anchor the analytic framework in studies on modern languages in order to make it possible not only to compare the state of affairs in Latin with modern languages, but also to inform the (deficient) data for Latin (and *vice versa*).

2.2   Corpus

Since a word for *yes* usually occurs as an immediate response to something, we need to turn our attention away from classical Latin and towards other, non-standard sources. In this section I briefly discuss candidate sources and decide on the corpus.

When looking for spoken Latin or the sources which imitate it, in the words of Väänänen, Latin literature in the proper sense does us no favours, since 'the man of the streets, the Roman "as such" barely appears in it' (Väänänen 2006: 14). Since, additionally, we are looking for

spontaneous conversation, with one turn following another,[10] the list is even shorter than the standard list of sources for the so-called 'vulgar' or 'colloquial' Latin.[11] Without claiming that no instances of *yes* can be found elsewhere,[12] the following authors seem to be the most likely candidates.

Cicero. The corpus of Cicero's personal correspondence (*Ad familiares*, *Ad Atticum*, *Ad Quintum fratrem*, *Ad Brutum*) contains hundreds of letters written in a spontaneous, unedited[13] language. The main advantage of this corpus is that it includes real people and refers to real events. In this sense, the material is realistic communication, unlike the fictional language of literary works. Even though correspondence does not contain dialogue in the strict sense, it contains the phenomenon called *diaphony* (see Kroon 1995: 108–15, Kroon 1998: 212, Roulet *et al.* 1985: 69–84). According to this concept, writers in their monological texts frequently incorporate conversational moves of real or fictitious speakers. This, in principle, means that the corpus should contain a number of reactions and would lend itself to the study of *yes*-responses.

However, the aim of the study, as stated in the introduction, is to combine qualitative and quantitative approach to reveal the positive response system which operated in Latin; the occurrences in Cicero's correspondence are, unfortunately, too sparse to enable a quantitative analysis. This is probably connected to the fact that writers frequently opt for a longer response (Potočnik 2023: 68) instead of a specialised *yes*-word or construction. While this may be partly stylistically motivated, the fact is that *yes* is underspecified; to be functional in a discourse, it should very closely follow the antecedents which triggers it.[14] As will be discussed in Section 3.2.2 of Chapter 3, its semantic content is limited to the abstract concept of polarity—*yes* does not mean 'you are right', but only that the utterer of *yes* considers the proposition true (Halliday 1979: 208). The addressee of *yes* will, in normal circumstances, be able to

---

[10] Defined by Levinson as 'that familiar predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking, which generally occurs outside specific institutional settings like religious services, law courts, classrooms and the like' (1983: 284).

[11] Useful discussions are available in Dickey and Chahoud (2010).

[12] There are sources which imitate dialogue to some extent, such as philosophical dialogues by Cicero; apart from being written in classical Latin, however, the co-interactant's responses might be biased towards elaborateness of expression, rather than merely providing a positive response to the proposition expressed. In this study, I am mainly interested in the latter, rather than the former.

[13] By 'unedited' I do not mean the editorial process, but rather that the letters appear not to have been 'worked on' in order to approach the Classical Latin to the same extent as Cicero's forensic and philosophical dialogues were. On the other hand, it should be noted that Cicero's claim in *Ad familiares* 9.21.1 that he writes in *plebeio sermone*, is not to be taken as a sociolinguistic label of colloquial language in the modern sense, but rather a stylistic one (Clackson 2011: 506).

[14] In this sense, *yes* has a lot in common with deictic expressions.

correctly understand what *yes* refers to only if they are within earshot of the conversation (or its electronic equivalent). As observed in Chapter 1, receiving a letter with only the word *yes* written on it would hardly provide enough information to decode the message. That is why even in the rare cases when positive responses do occur in the letters, the author prefers to use a more elaborate formulation. Additionally, since one focus of this study is the development of positive response particles from longer constructions (in practice it means deciding which one is meant in each specific instance), even those instances in the correspondence which do seem to contain the construction in question will not necessarily be useful for the purposes of this study, since it would be impossible to see whether the author used a longer formulation because of the mode of communication or because a specialised word for a positive response was not available. Thus, while the spontaneous Latin of Cicero's correspondence might prove useful in a future study of a wider orientation, I shall leave it out for now.

Petronius. Another work frequently cited as a source for spoken Latin is *Satyrica* by Petronius.[15] It contains a lot of conversations, but unfortunately not many positive responses, especially not conventionalised ones. While it does not lend itself to quantitative study, however, it is useful on a case-by-case basis (see Section 5.2.1 of Chapter 5). It will also be a useful source in a study oriented towards the strategy which I, in this study, refer to as 'implicit positive response' (see Section 2.5 of this chapter), especially regarding the role of the particle *immo* within that strategy.[16]

Plautus and Terence. The comedies of Plautus and Terence[17] are the principal sources for dialogue in Latin. While nominally set in Greece (faithful to their Greek originals), these comedies are in fact very much Roman. The stories acted out by a set of stock characters reflect the social reality of the Roman Republic—through the characters' storylines, allusions to historical events, and explicit or implicit allusions to the Roman legal system. A frequent source of humour in the comedies is, for instance, the fact that the matron of the house (*matrona*) often has power over her husband (*senex*), which is made possible by the dowry she brings to the house. However, in Athens, a woman only inherited if the father had no sons (Fantham 2019: 252, note 17).

---

[15] That, however, is not unproblematic, in that one 'cannot be certain how much weight to accord to the views of a member of the elite about the speech of the lower classes in a satirical novel' (Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 237).

[16] See Rosén (2003) for a more general analysis if *immo* in Petronius; see Thesleff (1960: 64–7).

[17] Henceforward referred to as 'Roman comedy'. *Fabula togata* is not considered here.

One of the main advantages of the corpus of Plautus and Terence is its size. The 21 comedies by Plautus (including the partially preserved *Vidularia*) contain c. 185 000 words; the comedies by Terence c. 55 000. This makes it likely that our hypotheses will be statistically supported. The corpus is, additionally, of such a size that it is possible to analyse the whole corpus within a reasonable timeframe.

The comedies of both authors are action-packed, so there are hundreds of actions and reactions, both physical and verbal. Verbal reactions are very accessible to the analyst. The fact that behaviour of stock characters and plot are predictable has some disadvantages, such as uniform and limited dialogues, which are not comparable to a modern linguistic corpus of spontaneous conversation. The main role in almost every comedy, for instance, is played by the slave. The fact that the slave is attributed the highest number of lines (Barrios-Lech 2016: 268) means that he is likely to get a lion's share of directives in the corpus, which results in over-representation of directives. Since directives are so frequent, this might skew the statistical analysis and suggest that positive responses to directives (usually the echo response) are much more important and entrenched in the speaking community than they actually are. Secondly, the fact that all action is performed on a stage, results in a high share of verbs of movement and a high share of responses to them (exchanges of the type *abi—eo*), which might again suggest that the echo response was much more widespread in Latin than it actually was (see Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4). While the numbers of occurrences are still given in tables, such biases are taken into account in the qualitative analysis following the tables.

The existence of stock characters, on the other hand, offers some advantages for the analyst as well. Since one usually knows the background and the motivations of speakers fairly well, it may be easier to determine the character of the expression analysed and even the characters' illocutionary intent, famously elusive in historical corpora. Additionally, since the stock characters are supposed to represent one social group, the comedies make it possible to study social factors which influence the choice of one positive response strategy over another. The stock characters are exaggerated, which might seem a disadvantage at first. However, I would argue that the very fact that it is exaggerated represents stronger evidence that a particular expression is characteristic of a speaker's stock role (a suggestion to that effect is found in Risselada 1993: 15). This is, in my opinion, all the more true for the so-called saturnalian scenes and other types of comedy-within-comedy. When one character imitates another, one can assume that they will deliberately exaggerate the imitated character's speech patterns in order to make it crystal clear to the audience that the role reversal has taken place.

Based on the assessment of the sources above and on the aims of the study, I take the comedies of Plautus and Terence as the main sources for my investigation. The final corpus[18] for this study (henceforward 'the corpus') thus consists of:

- 20 entirely preserved comedies by Plautus: *Amphitruo*, *Asinaria*, *Aulularia*, *Bacchides*, *Captivi*, *Casina*, *Cistellaria*, *Curculio*, *Epidicus*, *Menaechmi*, *Mercator*, *Miles gloriosus*, *Mostellaria*, *Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus*, *Rudens*, *Stichus*, *Trinummus*, *Truculentus*
- One partially preserved Plautus' comedy *Vidularia*;
- Six comedies by Terence: *Phormio*, *Hecyra*, *Adelphoe*, *Heauton timorumenos*, *Eunuchus*, *Andria*.

The comedies span the period 212/207 BCE to 160 BCE; around 212–207 BCE, *Asinaria* is thought to have been performed for the first time (Sedgwick 1949: 382; de Melo 2011: 137–8); and the year 160 marks the performance of *Adelphoe* and the third performance of *Hecyra*. The language attested is of course not limited to this period only. We must assume that both authors followed a literary standard. Since standardisation (and language change in general) is a fairly long process, the language crystallised in the comedies of Plautus may apply to several decades before 212/207 BCE; the language of Terence to some decades after 160 BCE. The fact that the study is limited to these two authors means that any results of this study will not apply to Latin in general, but to Old Latin[19] only.

2.2.1   What language does the corpus represent?

The question what register of language Plautus and Terence represent has been a topic of some debate and rightly so, for its resolution has implications for the applicability of the results obtained in any linguistic investigation into their language, as well as for the target audience of the study. If it turns out that the expressions studied here are a part of their 'artistic language' or 'theatre-speak'[20], the results are probably going to be less interesting to general linguistics

---

[18] The reader should note that I take the comedies of Plautus and Terence as a unit—as one corpus, rather than two corpora—even though the two authors differ both in themes and language. The differences that might be revealed in terms of positive responses, will be discussed where appropriate. For differences between Plautus and Terence see especially Maltby (1976), Karakasis (2005), Karakasis (2019: 151–70), and de Melo (2011: 321–43).
[19] Following Clackson and Horrocks (2007), I adopt the label 'Old Latin' for the language of Plautus and Terence (see Penney 2011: 220 for a brief discussion on the terminology).
[20] By 'artistic language' I henceforward refer to the Plautine and Terentian *Kunstsprache* (Happ 1967) or 'artificial language' (Palmer 1954), that is, their artistic language as a whole; by 'theatre-speak' I refer to features of the language of the Roman comedy, such as (what I consider) fixed dialogic formulae and phrases, and features which

and more interesting for literary studies; in this case, students of literature and theatrical conventions will likely be the primary target audience. If, however, the results prove to be a faithfully imitated 'language of the street', the results will be interesting to several subdisciplines of linguistics, including language typology and comparative linguistics.

Both of these extreme ends of the spectrum are plausible. On the one hand, it has become something of a truism to state that the playwright's survival depended on the audiences' applause and therefore the language of the comedies must have resonated with their language. This can be taken as an argument that linguistic findings are applicable to a world beyond Roman comedy. On the other hand, the playwrights could count on audiences being familiar with established dramatic conventions (Manuwald 2019: 18), which means that as long as an expression in question was heard regularly onstage, it need not have been heard on the street for the audience to appreciate it. This will serve as a caveat in interpreting the results.

The truth probably lies somewhere in between. First of all, Palmer (1954: 88), after noticing a range of colloquial features and hypothesizing that the language of Plautus is a language of the street, at the end firmly concludes that the colloquial elements are merely some ingredients among many from which Plautus has created a 'highly elaborate and artificial language'. His conclusions on Terence's artificial language are even stronger (*ibid.* 93). Secondly, the language of Plautus has been shown by Happ (1967) to contain a mixture of styles, some of it as elevated as epic or tragedy. Haffter (1934) has shown that there is a distinction between the language of *senarii* and other verses. Additionally, as mentioned above, the exigencies of production surely played a role in in at least some aspects of the language represented in the corpus, thus skewing any statistically based conclusions on the distribution of particular expressions.

The conclusions on the artificiality of the authors' idiom, while true, seem to have often been based on what I would provisionally call explicit colloquialisms: insults, curses, Graecisms, neologisms, etc. In recent years, however, researchers who have started applying methods from the school of Conversation Analysis (CA)[21] to Plautus and Terence, have discovered that many features pertaining to conversation structure known from modern languages—such as turn-

---

were likely conditioned by the exigencies of production, for instance the high frequency of verbs of movement or the echo response of compliance (see Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4). The boundaries between them are of course fuzzy.

[21] Initially a strand of sociology, pioneered by Harvey Sacks, studying mechanisms and rules of conversation as a social phenomenon based on naturally occurring data (Sacks *et al.*1974 is a classic paper). The methods of CA soon gained importance in (socio)linguistics.

taking strategies, feedback (e.g., Berger 2020a, 2020b), preference structure, and common ground (e.g., Risselada 2021)—are reflected in Roman comedy as well. The value of these discoveries is that these levels of conversation are what one may provisionally call 'implicit colloquialisms' and thus harder to manipulate: while the fact that slaves used Graecisms was presumably common knowledge and the authors could freely use them to enrich the speech patterns of their slaves, the same authors were probably not explicitly aware of the intricacies of conversational structure, relatively recently revealed by Conversation Analysts. The expressions used on this level of communication—which is related to implicit conversational expectations in the speech community and is supported by cross-linguistic findings—are, in my opinion, more convincing evidence of the authenticity of Latin than the explicit features listed above.

As will be shown throughout the analytic chapters, the positive response strategies belong, to some extent, to both of these groups: they are the vocabulary which could be, and was, used by the playwrights to lend distinctive speech patterns to their characters; they are however, as is usual for *yes* in other languages, also regularly used in conversation management.

2.3 Formal and functional diversity of positive response strategies

If we enter *yes* in the search box, the following conversation between Sosia and his look-alike Mercury is the first one to show up:

(1)   *Mercurius: ain vero?*

        *Sosia: **aio enim vero**.*

        'Do you say so?—Yes, I say so indeed.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 344)

Mercury asks Sosia, whether he really means what he is saying. Sosia confirms by repeating a substantial part of the question. There is no one single word which would convey the meaning of *yes*. Rather, it is the act of repetition which serves as *yes*. The conversation still showed up in the search results, because *yes* was added in the translation. However, it might as well not have been, since 'I say so indeed' would do the job just as well as the response with the added *yes*. My query was clearly flawed, since it is quite likely—or at least it cannot be excluded—that in many such conversations *yes* actually is omitted.

This becomes even more obvious in the example (2) below, where the confirmation is clearly present—twice—but due to the absence of *yes* in translation, the example does not show up in the search results.

(2)   *Euclio: atque id si scies qui apstulerit, mihi indicabis?*
        *Lyconides: **faciam**.*
        Euclio: nec partem tibi ab eo quisque est indipisces nec furem excipies?
        *Lyconides: **ita**.*
        'And if you find out who took it away, you'll inform me?—I will.—And you won't take a share from that man, whoever he is, or give shelter to the thief?—No. (Plautus, *Aulularia* 774–6).

Euclio is interrogating a terrified young man Lyconides, who seems very eager to agree to everything. The antecedent is a question. However, instead of any one Latin word for *yes*, Lyconides responds with the verb *facio* in the future. The English translation avoids *yes* as well, using 'I will' instead, which means the same as *yes*. This is the first indication that speaking about *yes* is not precise enough, as it does not cover all the ways to confirm even in English, let alone in Latin. In order to cover all the formal realisations, I refer to the expressions used to provide a positive response as 'the positive response strategies'. To avoid difficulties arising from the fact that, in English, one *confirms* a piece of information, but after a lengthy argument one *concedes* that something is the case, and the fact that one typically *agrees* to a course of action, rather than confirms it, I have settled for a not-too-restricted, but admittedly quite unwieldy 'providing a positive response' to cover all these functions.

To return to the example above, Lyconides agrees to the next question by using *ita*, an anaphoric adverb, meaning 'thus' or 'so', but frequently used in positive responses. It looks like a good candidate for an equivalent of the English *yes*; however, the relationship is not straightforward, since *yes* is only used for 'saying yes', while *ita* is, in most of its occurrences in Latin, still used for the anaphoric 'so'. Much of this work will be dedicated to answering the question to what extent *ita* is an equivalent of *yes*, i.e., whether it is a 'positive response particle'.

As far as our collection goes, the fact is that the search query 'yes' would miss the example (2), but also any examples like (1), where *yes* is omitted. On the other hand, it would return examples like (3) and (4) below.

(3)   *Amphitruo: [...] nunc domum ibo atque ex uxore hanc rem pergam exquirere,*
        quis fuerit quem propter corpus suom stupri compleuerit. **nam** *me quam illam*
        quaestionem inquisitam hodie amittere mortuom satiust. [...]
        'Now I'll go home and continue questioning my wife about this matter, who it
        was she filled her body with shame for. **Yes**, I'd rather be dead than let this
        question go unexamined.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1015–8)

In (3), there is a *yes* in translation, but again no such thing in the original. This is, of course,
nothing unusual. As (1) and (2) show, there are any number of expressions which can be used
to say *yes* in Latin and many—indeed, most, as is it turns out—do not look like *yes*. The fact
that (3) is not a conversation—a positive response should be responding to something—but
rather a monologue, can be easily accommodated. It is possible to have something akin to a
dialogue with oneself: 'Have I made the right decision? Yes, I think so' (the phenomenon is, as
mentioned above, also referred to as diaphony).

However, the problem with (3) is more serious. There is no question which would require a
response, nor a statement in need of reassurance. It seems that *yes* is not doing its usual job
here. It is a translation for the explanatory *nam* in the original, which seems to introduce an
explanation why Amphitruo decides to interrogate his wife. *Yes* acts as cohesive device between
two spoken utterances in a loose causal relationship—a function, not fulfilled by any Latin *yes*-
word in my corpus. This is thus not an example which belongs to a study on positive responses
narrowly conceived.

The example (4) is another false positive which shows up in the results.

(4)   *Sosia: [...] nam ut dudum ante lucem a portu me praemisisti domum—*
        Amphitruo: **quid igitur?**
        'When you sent me ahead home from the harbor, a while ago, before
        sunlight—**Yes**? What?' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 602–3)

There is again no utterance which would seek a confirmation. Sosia does not finish speaking
yet, when something in what he is saying catches Amphitruo's attention, so that he interrupts
him with *quid igitur*, lit. 'what then', which was rendered in English by 'Yes? What?' This
illustrates another function of *yes* in English. While in this case, Sosia was not trying to catch
Amphitruo's attention, *yes* here belongs to a derivative functional category of signalling
attention, along with answering a phone call with *yes* or answering a call from the other side

of the packed room. However, in my corpus, positive response particles are not used for responding to a call.[22]

What do the four examples above show? If looking for the word *yes* in translations of Latin comedies is insufficient, the example (2) shows that trying to identify a word (or words) for *yes* in Latin and then looking for them would not be in any way an improvement. If *ita* is predictable, if *faciam* could be seen, for the sake of argument, somewhat predictable—although looking for all the forms of *facio* would hardly be an efficient method—(1) is completely unpredictable: since the positive response is provided by repetition, rather than any one word, the possibilities for a repetition functioning as a positive response strategy are infinite. A careful reading of relevant texts and identifying positive response strategies on a case-by-case basis is the only way, if one hopes to collect a database on positive response strategies—in any language, not only in Latin.

The examples (1) and (2) thus show that saying *yes* to something can be achieved in different, formally unpredictable ways. In order to accommodate this, I have chosen the label 'positive response strategy' (instead of a *yes*-word or a *yes*-particle) for any expression which provides a positive response. While the definition is now very inclusive, there is still the practical problem of compiling our database. Since positive responses are formally unpredictable, we need to find some criterion to decide what to include in the database and to avoid cases like (3) and (4). We may, for instance, ask ourselves what a positive response does.

In (2), Euclio, who had a pot of gold stolen from him, is trying to secure Lyconides' help in getting it back. We could say that he is trying to influence Lyconides' future actions. Lyconides, who is not in a position to say no, reassures him and commits himself to carrying out the action that is asked of him. Let us now compare that situation with the following example.

(5)   *Lysidamus: sed etiamne habet nunc Casina gladium?*
            Pardalisca: **habet***, sed duos.*
            'But does Casina still have a sword?—She does; two, actually.' (Plautus,
            Casina 691–2)

In (5), Lysidamus is asking the house maid Pardalisca whether Casina is still raging with the sword. Pardalisca responds by repeating the verb. While Euclio tried to make Lyconides behave in a certain way in the future, Lysidamus is doing something else: he is trying to obtain a piece

---

[22] But see the example (44) in Section 5.2.5 of Chapter 5.

of information. Pardalisca, in turn, is not committing herself to any action—by providing the information Lysidamus wanted, her job is done. What Lyconides and Pardalisca do by providing their respective positive responses, is clearly different, both in terms of what was exchanged in the conversation (Halliday 1984: 11, see Section 3.4 of Chapter 3) and in terms of their involvement. The positive response in (1) is different in yet another way. Mercury is not looking for information nor is he making Sosia do anything. His question is rhetorical and does not necessarily expect a response. By responding to it, Sosia is in fact challenging Mercury.

Even though the antecedents in (1), (2), and (5) have little in common—they are different speech acts—and the positive responses are different as well, it is still possible to identify an underlying commonality. In all cases, the speakers express *commitment*.[23] Sosia commits to the truth of his previous statement, Lyconides commits to doing something in the future, and Pardalisca commits to the truth of the information she is currently providing.

Selecting the cases for this study based on the vague criterion of commitment solves the problem of the formal unpredictability, excludes the false positives, as in (3) and (4), and still promises a sizeable database to study the forms of positive responses and their use in some detail. However, while the examples (3) and (4) are now easily excluded from consideration, they illustrate another important reality of the positive response strategies. They show that a positive response strategy can be used for very different purposes, having little or nothing to do with expressing commitment. This is obvious in English, as shown by (3) and (4), and the same goes for many languages of the European linguistic area. There is no evidence that positive responses in Latin were used for responding to a call, as in (4)—at least it does not show up in my corpus.[24] However, there is no reason to assume that they were not used in other derivative functions. One such secondary function is that of taking the floor in the conversation, attested in many modern languages as well as in Latin (see Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 and sections 5.2.1–5.2.2 of Chapter 5).

While taking the conversational floor is a secondary function from the point of view of providing a positive response, it has to be acknowledged already at this stage that positive response strategies themselves tend to be borrowed from other functions, which means that the function of providing a positive response is itself a secondary function of something. *Ita* is

---

[23] The notion of *commitment* is profitably applied to the analysis of speech acts by Risselada (1993).
[24] See note 22.

primarily an anaphoric adverb, and it is that function which makes it particularly suitable for a positive response strategy.

2.4 A formal categorization of positive responses

To draw generalisations regarding the formal realisations of a vaguely defined function means to find a set of categories. However, studying language use means studying a system in constant motion. This was briefly seen above, where it was observed that the positive response function of *ita* is a secondary function. In the case of *yes* in English, prior history is obscured (it is thought to come from *gyse*, a form of the verb *be* in subjunctive—similar to *fiat* in Latin; see Wallage and van der Wurff 2013); the subsequent development, however, is eminently observable in uses such as those in (3) and (4). This means that any category—however indispensable the act of categorisation may be—is a temporary approximation and at the time of writing already obsolescent.

Table 2.4a below shows the formal categories of *all* positive responses found in the corpora of Plautus and Terence. The paragraphs below provide an overview. It is meant as an attempt to systematise what is formally a very diverse area. The purpose of this section is to illustrate the whole system at a glance before further narrowing down the focus of this study.

Positive response types	*Positive response subtypes*	*Positive response strategies*
Echo Response[25]	(full) echo response	*audi—audio*
	partial echo response	*congredere—gradior*
	substituted echo response	*dic—eloquar*
Non-Echo Response	pro-forms	*faciam, ago*
	(potential) particles	*ita? sic? etiam? fiat? licet?*
	emphatic	*maxume, admodum, planissume, sane*[26]
	implicit	*servus ego?—atque meus.*

---

[25] The pair of labels 'echo response' and 'non-echo response' are taken from Jones (1999).
[26] For some interactional uses of sane see Risselada (1998).

Other conventional responses	*Quidni, quippini, fateor*
Ad hoc responses	*Verum dicis*, etc.

Table 2.4a

Echo response. A positive response is provided by repeating the whole antecedent or a relevant part of it (see Chapter 4 for references). Both realisations are labelled as 'full echo responses' or 'echo responses' for short. The label 'partial echo response' is reserved for cases, where only a part of the verb in the antecedent is repeated. 'Substituted echo responses' are those where the verb from the antecedent is substituted by another verb which is close in meaning and no additional pragmatic meaning—beside providing the positive response—is identifiable. In this study, only the full echo response (henceforward referred to simply as the 'echo response') is described.

Non-echo responses. All other positive response strategies—those not featuring any repetition from the antecedent—are labelled 'non-echo responses'. These include:

- *Pro-forms.* A positive response is provided by substituting the echo response by a pro-form, such as a verb with a wide spectrum of functions (*ago*, *facio*), a demonstrative or a personal pronoun (*hic*, *tu*). A pro-form is a semantically empty or weak form which obtains its meaning in relation to the antecedent. However, in this study, cases of echoed pronouns and pro-forms are included in the 'echo response' category.

- *Positive response particles.* Positive response particles are particles specialized for the discursive function of providing a positive response, such as the word *yes* in English. Just like the echo response, they carry nothing more nor less than a positive polarity and they can be used instead of the positive response. On this basis, one could consider them substitutes; the fact is, however, that they can co-occur with the echo response, so they are not really substitutes (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 208). Their precise linguistic description is thus an open question. Most positive response particles were probably pro-forms at some stage of their development. While some pro-forms remain pro-forms, others become grammaticalized expressions whose sole function is providing a positive response. One of the aims of this work is to outline the criteria based on which any of the words listed in the table could be considered positive response particles. The five strategies under '(potential) positive response particles— *Ita, sic, etiam, fiat, licet*—are

listed there provisionally; some or all of them might have to be included in other categories.

- *Implicit positive responses*. While in the case of all other strategies, the positive response is overtly realised (by the act of repetition or by a specialised word), in this case, the positive response is left implicit; instead, the speaker adds some additional information. For the additional information to be accepted, the proposition in question to which the additional information is added must, in accordance with Grice's principle of cooperation, be accepted as well. In other words, while the utterance which contains only additional information, does not in itself provide a positive response, it implies it. The phenomenon is not limited to Latin.

- *Emphatic positive responses*. Contrary to the strategies above, they provide more than a positive response, i.e., they provide an emphatic positive response. While not studied here in detail, they are interesting from the diachronic point of view, since they are attested as a source for positive response strategies (cf. the Finnish *kyllä*, which means 'enough, sufficiently,' but also functions as a positive response strategy).

- *Other conventional positive responses*. Positive response strategies, as those discussed above, are conventional strategies speakers have at their disposal to provide a positive response. However, there exist a number of other ways of providing a positive response, such as 'that's right', or, as in the table, *quidni* 'why not?' What the expressions in this category have in common, is that they are conventionalized, that is, they are a part of an inventory of expressions which can be drawn upon to achieve the communicative end of providing a positive response.

- *Other responses*. Just like the previous category, this category contains utterances which function as positive responses by virtue of some lexical property, e.g., 'I accept what you're saying'. The boundary between this category and the previous one is as fuzzy as it is porous: the main difference between the two is the degree of conventionalization, so assigning positive responses to one or the other is to some degree arbitrary (what constitutes a high frequency?); additionally, if a positive response attains a sufficient frequency, it can be moved to the 'other conventional

positive responses' category (and potentially to other categories discussed here). It is assumed here that most, if not all, positive responses start in this category.[27]

These categories are strictly formal and synchronic. The categories itself ignore the fact that any one positive response strategy can be sorted into several categories and can belong to several categories simultaneously, depending on one's theoretical orientation and on the point on the timeline, either relative (a positive response particle is assumed here to originate in the echo response, see Potočnik 2023: 86–7) or real (2nd century BCE vs. the Classical period). However, even if limited to a synchronic state, the categorization is not straightforward and unproblematic. That is because any instance of language use is at the same time constrained and free: constrained in the sense that language use follows rules of convention; free in the sense that these rules are frequently flouted for various reasons, such as creativity, error, emphasis, etc. As we will see, for instance, addressees in Plautus and Terence frequently deliberately misinterpret the illocutionary intent of the antecedent. In quantitative analyses, I categorised such cases according to addressee's understanding, because it is their understanding which determines the form of the response.

2.5   Narrowing the object of study

As shown by the number forms and functions of positive response strategies in this chapter, as well as by the number of categories in Table 2.4 above, a detailed pragmatic study of all categories of positive response strategies would not be sustainable. Since good overviews are provided by Thesleff (1960), Müller (1997), and Pinkster (2015), I will only focus on selected positive response strategies.

Due to its widespread use in Plautus and Terence as well as its importance for the European linguistic area and Indo-European linguistics, I will dedicate a chapter to the echo response. Among the non-echo responses, I will limit the study to responses containing *ita*, *sic*, *fiat*, *licet*, and *etiam*. If Latin had a word equivalent to *yes*, *ita*, *sic*, and *etiam* are often considered the most likely candidates.[28] While these are mostly used after antecedents about information and

---

[27] However, the label 'other' should not be taken too freely, since very little in conversation is completely unexpected due to rules of conversation (discussed esp. in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 and Section 5.2.1 of Chapter 5).

[28] Pinkster (1972: 140), speaking of Latin in general, mentions *ita* and *etiam* as the most likely candidates. For his recent overview, see Pinkster (2015: 370–8).

facts, I include *fiat* and *licet* as examples of positive response strategies limited to action-oriented antecedents (potential equivalents of *alright*).

3 How to Study Positive Responses

3.1 Introduction

Positive response strategies are, just like responses in general, pragmatically defined (Brown *et al.* 2009: 514). This means that, despite being a narrower category, most methodological difficulties associated with describing responses apply to them. The aim of this chapter is to suggest a set of tools, anchored in previous studies on positive response strategies, which should make the task of describing the Latin positive response system and individual positive response strategies more manageable.

Based on the literature on positive response systems in modern languages, Section 3.2 attempts to establish a set of cross-linguistically valid properties of the echo response and those of positive response particles. Based on these findings, I then propose tools or heuristics which should make it possible to study and describe the Latin positive response system and put it side by side with similar studies in other languages. These heuristics are then discussed in more detail in subsequent sections.

3.2 Echo response and positive response particles across languages

3.2.1 Echo response

While treatments of responses in general are scarce,[29] several studies on the echo response are available: Jones (1999) on Welsh with valuable cross-linguistic data, Sorjonen (2001) on Finnish, Armstrong (2008) on Brazilian Portuguese, and Holmberg (2016) on Finnish with cross-linguistic data. From these studies the following basic properties emerge.

Default positive response strategy. While, upon pragmatic analysis, it usually turns out that languages do not fit neatly into one category in Sadock and Zwicky's (1985: 189–91) typology, but have mixed systems, it is usually the case that the echo response is still a default positive response strategy in these languages. Default is understood here as both capable of being used in most contexts and used in neutral contexts.

Sorjonen (2001: 37), studying the division of labour between the echo response and particles *nii(n)* and *joo* in Finnish, finds that in her corpus, the echo response (referred to by her as 'repeat') is used more than twice as often as the particle *joo* in response to polar

---

[29] See Holmberg (2016: 10–2) for rare exceptions.

questions (referred to by her as 'V-interrogatives'). Additionally, as found by Raevaara (1993, quoted in Sorjonen 2001: 35), the echo response typically occurs after polar questions, whereas a particle tends to occur after such antecedents as repairs, whereby the utterer verifies whether they have heard correctly, because their background knowledge does not conform to that of the co-interactant (see Schegloff 2007: 100–6 for a useful treatment of repairs in Conversation Analysis). Sorjonen (2001: 36), similarly, finds that 'a repeat is a basic way of offering an affirmation', whereas *joo* responds to a question that 'seeks confirmation of an issue that has already been mentioned in the prior talk or that the questioner offers as an inference from the co-participant's prior talk.'

Findings for Brazilian Portuguese confirm this. Armstrong (2008) studies positive response strategies in Brazilian Portuguese based on epistemic assumptions held by co-interactants. Examining the division of labour between the echo response (referred to by her as 'simple verbal response'), the echo response with personal pronoun, the echo response with the particle *sim*, forms of *ser* 'to be', and demonstrative pronoun *isso* 'that', the author finds that in cases where neither compelling evidence nor belief can be identified, the echo response is used (Armstrong 2008: 291). In other words, unless special pragmatic circumstances are present, the echo response is the felicitous response. When special circumstances are present, other strategies come into play (the following is an outline based on Armstrong 2008: 291–5, where the reader will find examples):

- *The echo response with personal pronoun* is used when Speaker 2's belief regarding a proposition is different from Speaker 1's, that is, when Speaker 2 wishes to confirm unexpected information;
- *The echo response with sim* intensifies the echo response and is used to refute Speaker 1's evidence-based belief; this strategy is pragmatically stronger, which is necessary in order to counter the negative belief by Speaker 1;
- The verb *ser* 'to be' behaves, first of all, as a 'dummy verb', that is, after antecedents without the main verb or to ratify information activated in the discourse (or, in the terminology of the present study, it typically responds to repairs) and confirms Speaker 1's inferences formed in the discourse;
- *Isso* 'that' behaves similarly to *ser* 'to be', except that it confirms Speaker 1's inferences based on evidence further back in the discourse.

In short, in both Finnish and Brazilian Portuguese, the echo response is used after run-of-the-mill yes-no questions, where no special circumstances can be identified; in other cases, specialised strategies are used. This is evident from both the frequency of use (Sorjonen 2001: 37) and pragmatic analysis of contexts (Sorjonen 2001: 35–6 and Armstrong 2008).

Neutral positive response strategy. Apart from being a default positive response strategy in Finnish and Brazilian Portuguese, the echo response is also a neutral positive response strategy in the sense of 'not carrying any special emphasis'. Special emphasis is required to counter opposite belief, or, to use a more widely applicable formulation, belief which tends towards the negative pole. This tends to be the case after repairs. One piece of evidence for neutrality of the echo response in Brazilian Portuguese is the very existence of the categories 'echo response with personal pronoun' and 'echo response with *sim*', which, as Armstrong (2008) shows, are used to counter Speaker 1's negative belief.

Regarding Welsh, Jones states that 'nominal subjects can never occur in a response' (1999: 172) and that 'responsives', as he refers to positive response strategies, tend to be used without a subject (1999: 174).[30] However, according to Thomas (1973: 174, cited in Jones 1999: 174), subjects are only used in 'strong responses'. This implies that in Welsh the echo response is not inherently emphatic either.

Based on the cross-linguistic use of echo response, it is then possible to conclude that the echo response is a neutral, that is, non-emphatic, positive response strategy.

One word echoed. The next property observed in literature is that the echo response is typically realised by one word, two at the most. In all Armstrong's (2008) examples of Brazilian Portuguese only the verb is echoed, except in those cases where *sim* or a pronoun is added (Armstrong 2008: 291–5). In Welsh, an echo response can only ever consist of the 'highest' verb, while in Finnish both 'the auxiliary' and the 'main verb' can be echoed (Holmberg 2016: 3). In most cross-linguistic examples offered by Jones (1999) and Holmberg (2016) one word is echoed.

While the present study is pragmatically oriented and we shall mostly speak of tendencies and trends, Holmberg's finding regarding the difference between Welsh and Finnish is a syntactic rule. This draws attention to the fact that the echo response strategies described in these studies

---

[30] Note that Jones (1999) detects no significant difference between responses *ydw* 'am' and *ydw i* 'I am' (1999: 174).

are parts of grammar, that is, grammaticalized linguistic resources as understood by Halliday (1984). This means that flouting these rules will result not only in an unexpected utterance, but will also constitute ungrammatical use and will render the sentence null and void. If the echo response was a default positive response strategy in Latin, it must have had similar rules, which rendered some uses grammatical and others ungrammatical. In this light, it should be kept in mind that the echo response in Latin was likely a part of grammar with rules and constraints. In this pragmatically oriented study, formation of precise syntactic rules will not be attempted. However, the pragmatic approach provided here should be helpful in any future efforts of that sort (see also discussion in Section 4.2).

Verb or focus element echoed. Another property of the echo response observed across languages is that when the whole proposition is questioned, the verb is echoed; when a specific part of the proposition is questioned, the focal element of the question is echoed (e.g., Press 1986: 110; Brown *et al.* 2009: 515; see also Potočnik 2023: 76). Compare the following examples from Sorjonen (2001: 35; translations of B's responses are mine):

(1)   *A: Ajoiks   Anna Helsinkiin   eilen?*
           drive.IPRF.[3SG].Q Anna   Helsinki.to   yesterday
           Did Anna drive to Helsinki yesterday?

    B: *Ajoi.*
        drive.IPRF.[3SG].
        Yes.

(2)   A: *Annaks ajoi   Helsinkiin   eilen?*
           Anna. Q   drive. IPRF.[3SG] Helsinki.to yesterday
           Was it Anna who drove to Helsinki yesterday?

    B: *Anna.*
        Yes, it was Anna.

In (1), the truth of the proposition 'Anna drove to Helsinki' is questioned. The felicitous way to provide a positive response to it is to echo the verb. In (2), Speaker 1 already knows that driving to Helsinki took place. What they are questioning is only a part of the proposition, namely, whether it was Anna who drove. The felicitous way to provide positive response to it is to echo the focal element, which, in this case, is *Anna*.

To summarise, based on the studies on echo response in modern languages, one observes that in echo-based and mixed-system languages, the echo response is (1) the default positive

response strategy; it also tends to be (2) the neutral, that is, non-emphatic, positive response strategy. In most cases, (3) one word is echoed (with the rest of the sentence elided, see Section 3.5 of this chapter) or two, rarely more. Finally, (4) when the whole proposition is questioned, the verb is echoed; when a specific part of the proposition is questioned, the focal element of the question is echoed.

3.2.2   Positive response particles

Studies dedicated specifically to positive response particles are hardly more frequent than those on the echo responses. Even though not focussed specifically to particles, Pope (1976) studied questions and answers from the point of view of generative syntax. In the section on answers (Pope 1976: 111–33), the author discusses answering systems in languages of the world (corresponding to Sadock and Zwicky 1985's typology) and restrictions on the choice of positive responses in English.

In recent years, the positive response particles have attracted more interest. A recent account is that of Holmberg (2016). Studying the syntax of *yes* and *no*, one of his main ideas is that these particles, even when they occur by themselves, have sentential structure with the rest of the sentence elided, because it is recoverable from the question. As demonstrated by Hansen (2020), such a syntactic account cannot handle authentic corpus data; even though it cannot account for attested data, however, it does provide useful concepts, such as the 'movement to C-domain' (see Section 3.5.1 below) important for determining the status of a positive response particle.

Hansen (2020), studies the distribution of response particles in French and shows, for instance, that while *si* is still sensitive to considerations of polarity and agreement, *oui* has assumed more interpersonal, interactional functions. Her approach is significant because it shows that no model can account for the use of positive response particles, if it does not take pragmatic considerations into account.

Apart from the echo response, Sorjonen (2001) also studies particles *joo* and *nii(n)*, which exemplify the heterogeneous nature of the so-called positive response particles. Their use tends to be limited to special pragmatic circumstances (Sorjonen, e.g., 2001: 280).

Wallage and Van der Wurff (2013), finally, attempt to reconstruct the positive response system of proto-Old English and discuss the etymology of *gyse*, the ancestor of *yes*. They highlight the importance of diachronic approaches in studying positive response strategies. Their findings,

moreover, suggest cross-linguistic similarities in linguistic substance which is susceptible to become grammaticalized into a positive response particle (cf. *fiat* 'may it happen', discussed in Section 5.2.3 of Chapter 5 and Section 6.3 of Chapter 6, and the proposed etymology of *gyse*, which involves a subjunctive of *be*).

The multiplicity of approaches to some extent reflects the notorious difficulty in placing the positive response particles in the linguistic system. Indeed, *yes* and *no* have been, among other designations, described as grammatically irregular (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 852), as pro-sentences (Schachter and Shopen 2007: 31) and as signals of polarity (Jones 1999: 7; Holmberg 2016: 15 and *passim*; Halliday and Hasan 1976: 208).

From these studies the following set of basic properties emerges.

Providing no more nor less than polarity. As Halliday and Hasan (1976: 208) put it, yes does not mean 'you are right', but only that the answer is positive. Holmberg (2016: 13) shows that a polar question is the semantic equivalent of a disjunctive statement, so that 'Do you want tea or coffee?' equals 'You want tea or you want coffee' (the example is from Holmberg 2016: 13). Speaker 2 is then invited to provide the polarity variable which will designate one of the two statements as true. Expressions such as *of course*, on the other hand, also positive response strategies, provide not only positive polarity, but also emphasis and possibly situation-dependent pragmatic meanings (surprise, shock, attitude, etc.). The 'polarity-only' property of yes and its equivalents in other languages can therefore be considered one of the basic properties of positive response particles.

Neutral (non-emphatic). On a related note, in particle-based languages, a positive response particle which provides no more than polarity, as is the case with *yes* in English, is also neutral in the sense of non-emphatic. The evidence for that again comes from the fact that another strategy is needed to counter negative belief:

(3)   What?! Is this true?—?Yes./Yes!/Yes, it is. (invented)

In order to counter the negative bias in the antecedent, a bare *yes* does not suffice. It has to be accompanied by an additional element, such as intonation, or combined with the echo response (cf. the reversed situation in Brazilian Portuguese above, where the neutral echo response needs to be accompanied by a personal pronoun or *sim* to achieve the same effect).

Since studying positive response particles inevitably involves a diachronic component, this is an important property. For several positive response particles in modern languages, it can be shown that they have developed from emphatic expressions or expressions which have at some stage been used to counter negatively biased questions. *Sic*, the origin of the Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese positive response particles, was at first, as suggested by Thesleff (1960: 27) a strong affirmation (see Section 5.2.2 of Chapter 5). The French particle *si*, another reflex of *sic*, which is now used for responding to negatively biased antecedents (like *doch* in German or *jo* in Swedish), has become restricted to countering negative polarity only since the 17th century; until then, it was also used as a marker of strong affirmation (Hansen 2020). In a similar development, in proto-Old English, *gyse*, the origin of *yes*, was used to give a positive response to a negatively biased question (Wallage and Van der Wurff 2013: 212).

Since in several cases, one can observe a diachronic trend of development from more emphatic towards less emphatic to, ultimately, non-emphatic, I consider the loss of emphasis (and the assumption that it was present at some point) another defining characteristic of positive response particles.[31]

Formally fixed. It goes without saying that particles, by definition, should be formally fixed. In many cases this is again the result of a diachronic development from longer expressions towards shorter ones, culminating in univerbation, as in the case of *gyse > yes* above, and/or phonological erosion, as in the case of *sic > si* and *yes > yeah*. The question of formal fixedness is of special interest for our study, since both multi-word—*ita est/sic est*—and one-word—*ita/sic*—expressions are present.

Utterance-peripheral location. Another property of the positive response particles seems to be the utterance-peripheral position in neutral contexts. Occurrences in modern languages seem to generally follow this pattern; the reader can most likely observe this in the everyday use in their mother tongue. This position seems to be the result of the interplay of several factors. First of all, the default adjacency pair *question—response* favours providing polarity as soon as possible. Preceding the polarity marker with something else could be seen as hesitant or worse, uncooperative.[32] In other contexts, such as *statement—response*, where provision of polarity is not a priority, a positive response particle still occurs at the beginning. The reason might be

---

[31] This is not to say that all modern positive response particles mentioned here are necessarily non-emphatic. A pragmatic analysis, of the sort conducted by Hansen (2020), might reveal a more nuanced division of labour. Armstrong (2008), as discussed above, shows that *sim*, the Portuguese positive response particle, is emphatic.

[32] But see the example (10) in Section 4.2.2 for a reversed order.

that it plays a cohesive role: an overt marker of agreement functions as a feedback strategy or a turn-taking strategy (or, indeed, both); a quick agreement shows that both co-interactants are of one mind.

As mentioned by Hansen (2020), some languages allow embedding, as in the following example (from Hansen 2020):

(4)   *J'ai demandé à Pierre s'il viendrait, et il m'a assuré que oui.*
        'I asked Pierre if he was coming, and he assured me that he was' [lit.: '…he assured me that *yes*.']; translated by Hansen 2020).

This example shows that the French *oui* allows embedding as a clause substitute. Spanish *sí* is used in a similar way to strengthen the echo response when countering negatively biased antecedents. Such cases, however, do not negate the utterance-peripheral tendency, as this type of embedding is a secondary development; in other words, their existence is predicated on the prior existence of a fully-fledged positive response particle. Phrase-internal position of *ita* in such cases as *ita dico*, *ita quaeso* or *ita est*, on the other hand, seems to be diachronically earlier than the particle stage. Utterance-peripheral position can therefore also be traced diachronically. As mentioned above, Holmberg (2016) uses the syntactic concept of movement from phrasal (P) to complement domain (C).

Utterance-peripheral position, for an analyst, implies presence of additional content in the response. This presence depends on the context of use—which adjacency pair is at play, that is, what antecedent the positive response strategy is triggered by—and, for instance, politeness considerations. It should be noted, however, that the designation 'utterance-peripheral' does not necessarily exclude utterances containing only the positive response particle, since the remainder of the sentence can simply be deleted under identity with the antecedent (Holmberg 2016: 2).

Co-occurrence with other positive response strategies. Even though it is tempting to see response particles, such as *yes* and *no* as substitutes or pro-forms, they are not; this was pointed out by Jones (1999: 18, in discussing 'responsives' in general), who cites as evidence many examples in which different positive response strategies co-occur. Holmberg (2016: 1 and *passim*) also argues that the 'ellipsis hypothesis' is superior to the 'substitution hypothesis'. He adduces the following quotation by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 209) as an early formulation of the hypothesis:

> It is possible to consider yes and no as clause substitutes. But they are not really substitutes; for one thing, they can be accompanied by part or even the whole of the clause for which they would be said to be substituting, and that is precluded from substitution as usually defined. For example in [Are you coming?] the answer ... could be *yes*, *yes I am*, or *yes I am coming*. They are realizations of a single clause feature, that of polarity, which is being expressed on its own instead of in association with the verbal group; and the fact that it is expressed on its own means that the whole of the remainder of the clause is presupposed (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 209, cited also in Holmberg 2016: 52).

Co-occurrence with other positive response strategies, be it the echo response or something else, is therefore another principal property of positive response particles.

In summary, positive response particles across languages typically provide (1) no more than polarity, they tend to be (2) neutral (although that does not apply to all of them), they are (3) formally fixed, (4) typically located at the periphery of the utterance, and (5) they can co-occur with other positive response particles.

3.2.3   Overview of the basic properties in echo and non-echo responses

Table 3.2.3a below attempts to systematise findings from the two sections above.

	Echo response	*Positive response particle*
Primacy	default in echo-based and mixed systems	/
Emphasis	neutral	neutral, sometimes emphatic
Form	one word echoed	formally fixed
Location	/	utterance-peripheral location
Relation with antecedent	verb or focal element echoed to provide polarity	special word introduced to provide (no more than) polarity
Co-occurrence with other positive response strategies	/	yes

Table 3.2.3a

The table is based exclusively on the literature discussed in this chapter. Since the studies have focussed on different properties of the two types of positive response strategies, it is asymmetrical. For instance, while we have established that the echo response tends to be the default positive response strategy in echo based or mixed-system languages, the table does not provide information on whether the positive response particles tend to be default in particle-based languages (even though that is probably the case). Secondly, while one of the defining characteristics of positive response particles is utterance-peripheral location, no such thing is established for the echo response. However, this does not mean that it does not apply to it— Holmberg (2016) shows that, syntactically, movement to C-domain applies to both the echo response and the particles. Finally, co-occurrence with positive response strategies was not discussed in connection to the echo response, although it applies to the echo response as well.

Since the purpose of this chapter is not to discuss both types of strategies according to the same parameters, but rather to provide a framework for studying their respective counterparts in Latin and other languages, the task is to find a way to study these basic properties in the corpus. Even though standard caveats associated with closed literary corpora apply (no native speaker intuition, the texts might follow a literary standard as well as that of spoken Latin, and the exact ratio of the two is usually unclear), there are still reliable indicators which, coupled with the size of the corpus, allow us to study the responses in Latin with some certainty. They are introduced in Table 3.2.3b. The column 'Property' contains the properties established above; the column 'Method' matches them to observable indicators in the corpus.

	Property	*Method*
Echo	default in echo-based and mixed systems	frequency, antecedent
	non-emphatic	antecedent, intensifiers
	one word echoed	form
	verb or focal element echoed to provide polarity	antecedent, form
Non-echo	neutral, sometimes emphatic	antecedent, intensifiers
	formally fixed	form, frequency

	utterance-peripheral position	position in response
	provision of polarity only	antecedent, intensifiers
	co-occurrence	position in response

Table 3.2.3b

Default in echo-based and mixed systems (echo). While the relative frequency provides the first indication, it is not a proof in itself, since it can be skewed by non-linguistic factors. Chapter 6 of this study, for instance, shows that one type of the echo response—echo response of compliance—is associated with lower characters. Since lower characters are allocated a disproportionate share of dialogue, frequency of the echo response does not reflect language reality in this case, but rather literary characteristics of the Roman comedy.

Distribution of a positive response strategy over a wide range of antecedents, on the other hand, is direct evidence of its 'usefulness' in various communicative situations. Conversely, if a strategy does not occur after a wide range of antecedents, this shows that its usage is restricted to specific contexts. Additionally, there is probably a corelation between a narrow range or antecedents and their markedness.

Non-emphatic (echo), *neutral*, *sometimes emphatic (particle)*, *provision of polarity only (particle)*. The nature of the antecedent allows observation of the degree of emphasis present in a positive response strategy. Since *sim* in Brazilian Portuguese and *joo* in Finnish tend to occur after repair antecedents—which imply negative bias on the part of the co-interactant— this is an indication that they are inherently emphatic (Sorjonen 2001 and Armstrong 2008). As will be shown in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 and section 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 of Chapter 5, there is a correlation between repair antecedents and the use of the emphatic positive responses in Latin as well. In this way, the presence or absence of bias in different antecedents reveals whether the echo response was neutral in Latin and to what extent such strategies as *ita* and *sic* were inherently emphatic. This is also directly linked to the 'polarity-only' property, expected from the positive response particles.

Another indicator of all three properties might be the presence of an intensifier. By hypothesis, if a non-echo response is followed by an intensifier after negatively biased antecedents, this might indicate that it is itself non-emphatic (although other factors, such as idiomatisation,

prevent straightforward generalisations, see Section 4.3.1 of Chapter 4 and Section 5.2.1 of Chapter 5).

One word echoed (echo). Form, one of the most eminently observable aspects of language in historical corpora, is straightforwardly linked to the 'one word echoed' property. It should be noted, again, that findings will not necessarily straightforwardly map onto conclusions on modern languages because of literary considerations, such as passages, where a series of functionally identical, but formally deliberately varied responses are given, or passages where a series of formally deliberately identical responses are given for humorous or aesthetic purposes (see Section 4.2.2 of Chapter 4).

Either verb echoed or another focal element echoed (echo). By observing the form and the nature of the antecedent, we can observe how the focal element of the antecedent determines the form the echo response takes (Brown *et al.* 2009: 515).

Degree of fixity (particle). The form of the non-echo response in the corpus, coupled to some extent with frequency, may suggest the degree of an expression's fixedness in Latin (taking into account the fact that literary language is more conservative than its spoken varieties, so the occurrence of, for instance, *ita est* in writing might occur in place of *itast* in spoken Latin).

Utterance-peripheral position (particle), *co-occurrence with other strategies (particle).* These properties are less eminently observable, since positive responses strategies frequently occur without any additional content, which can be due to aesthetic (prosody, penchant for repetition in Plautus) or situational factors (the character of the speaker, their current attitude, etc.). Consequently, any conclusions will often depend on a small set of occurrences where any statistical support is unlikely.

In the analytic chapters 4 and 5, frequencies will be provided wherever available. Each positive response strategy will be studied in terms of heuristics most accessible and relevant for them. I observe, for instance, the position of the non-echo responses in an utterance, because it can provide information regarding the stage of their development and is a good indicator whether the non-echo response is a positive response particle. I do not do the same for the echo response. In a study whose aim would be precise grammatical constraints of the echo response, this would be crucial; however, as will be explained in Section 4.2.2 of Chapter 4, I am only studying pragmatic tendencies here, in which case the position is not essential. In terms of the three positions (see Section 3.5 of this chapter), all occurrences of the echo response are assumed to

be located within the [sentence] position. Furthermore, in order to keep the study contained, I shall, except for the category of pronominal echoes, mostly ignore the presence of intensifiers in echo responses. The echo response will thus be studied in terms of form and antecedent; the non-echo responses will be studied in terms of form, antecedent, and position in utterance.

3.3   Forms of positive response strategies

3.3.1   Echo response

While the echo response has received some attention in the literature, the latter has been, as observed by Sorjonen (2001: 406), mostly focussed on such issues as the interaction between the polarity of the question and the polarity or the response, as well as the assumptions in the question and their influence on the choice of the response. Constraints on what tends to be repeated and in what circumstances are left out of the account. Determining these constraints is one of my aims in Chapter 4. The motivation for this line of research comes from the observation that in the corpus, virtually all parts of speech are found echoed, from verbs to pronouns to parts of clauses. The repetitions can be of any length, from one word to the whole antecedent, and anything in between. Finally, in terms of fidelity of the repetition, the material is found either unchanged, or with modifications. These range from grammatical (2nd to 1st person), to pragmatically motivated (active into passive voice, such as *dabis?—dabitur*), to entirely unexpected, such as echoing question particles together with everything else. This raises a number of questions, such as:

- Which of these options are marked and which unmarked?
- Are there constraints on the form of the echo response and what do they depend upon?
- Does the primacy of the verbal echo response, observed cross-linguistically, hold for Latin?

In order to address these questions, I investigate the formal realisations of the echo response in the corpus.

It serves to remind that 'a response' itself is an elusive concept; that in isolation, there is no such thing as a response; that an utterance is only a response following a suitable antecedent. More importantly, when an utterance is identifiable as a response, there are virtually no formal constraints to it and the truism that anything can be a response remains valid. Leaving nonsensical responses out of the account, to deserve the status of response, a response need

only be relevant and felicitous.[33] This can be realised in many ways (the list below is not exhaustive and is, in line with the topic of this study, limited to preferred options):

- By no response at all (and just doing what was asked);
- By a non-verbal response (such as a shrug),
- By a small set of specialized response-typical expressions (such as the positive response strategies studied here);
- By an *ad hoc*, unpredictable utterance;
- By a combination of one or more of the options above, taking into account that one option can be repeated several times.

To demonstrate with an invented example:

(5)   A: Make sure to get groceries on your way home!
        B_1: (leaves without saying a word, because B knows that A knows that B has a shopping list in their pocket)
        B_2: (shrugs in a resigned manner)
        B_3: Alright.
        B_4: I will get them.
        B_5: Alright, I will get them.

For our purposes, B_1 and B_2 can be safely skipped. B_3 is a specialized response-typical word and carries the meaning 'I will get groceries on my way home'. B_4 is a modified sentence answer, carrying the same meaning as B_3. B_5, finally, is a combination of B_3 and B_4 and caries the same meaning as B_3 and B_4—that is, all things being equal, it does not convey 'more of an agreement' or 'a stronger agreement' to the directive than the previous two responses.

The takeaways from this example are, first, that an unpredictable periphrasis for any specialized response-typical expression is always available and is, furthermore, usually no less valid, no less preferred, and no less felicitous than any of the specialized expressions;[34] and second, two responses do not imply twice the strength of a response.

---

[33] For Grice's maxim of relevance, see Grice (1975: 46 and *passim*) and a useful introduction by Levinson (1983: 107–9). See Austin (1962) for the notion of *felicity* (and especially *infelicity*).

[34] Cf. the tendency for a longer response in a written medium, discussed in Chapter 1.

The infinite unpredictability and permutability of positive responses are characteristic of any naturally occurring conversation. In this sense, the comedies of Plautus and Terence are remarkably naturalistic. Consider the following Latin example.

(6)   *Parmeno: [...] si mihi fidem das te tacituram, dicam.*
        *Philotis: **ad ingenium redis. fidem do: loquere***.
        'If you give me your word you'll keep it quiet, I'll tell you.—That's more like you. I give you my word. Say on.' (Terence, *Hecyra* 110–4)

In (6), the antecedent is a request for commitment. Similar to B$_5$ above, the response is of the compound type, that is, consisting of several positive response strategies: the unpredictable *ad ingenium redis*; the echo response *fidem do*; the substituted echo response *loquere*. The first is a comment on Parmeno's decision to tell (the implication being that he is a gossip). The second addresses the condition under which Parmeno is willing to tell; the third addresses the action antecedent (intention) and is an encouragement to Parmeno to actually tell the information.

In discussing these forms, it is hard to say whether one positive response strategy is more important than others, since all of them address different aspects of the conversation—they have different functions (conversation management, addressing the illocutionary intent, etc.). This means, importantly, that an utterance can be categorised in different ways, which has an impact on the database being collected (one utterance can be collected twice). However, not all of these forms will be studied here, such as the substituted echo response and the unpredictable *ad hoc* responses (see section 2.4 of Chapter 2).

As far as the echo response in the corpus is concerned, there is still the fact that anything can be repeated. Since the aim is to identify trends and a trend will only emerge if the right—that is, not too large—set of categories is chosen, it is necessary to determine such a set carefully. As a first step on the way to such a set, I consider the variability of the echo response and then proceed to forming a set of analytic categories to be used in Chapter 4, dedicated to the echo response.

As the organisational principle to discuss the variability of the echo response, I take the following variables: (a) what is repeated; (b) how much of the antecedent is repeated, and (c) how faithfully it is repeated.

(a) What is repeated. As mentioned above, any part of speech from the antecedent can be echoed, from verbs to adjectives, through pronouns, to question particles. Take the following two examples.

(7)   *Hegio: [...] fuistin liber?*
       *Tyndarus: **fui**.*
       '[...] Were you free before?—Yes, I was.' (Plautus, *Captivi* 628)

(8)   *Chrysalus: quia edepol certo scio, Volcanus, Luna, Sol, Dies, di quattuor,*
       scelestiorem nullum illuxere alterum.
       Nicobulus: quamne Archidemidem?
       *Chrysalus: **quam, inquam, Archidemidem**.*
       'Because I know for sure that the four gods Vulcan, Moon, Sun, and Day have never shone on any greater criminal.—Than Archidemides?—Yes, than Archidemides.' (Plautus, *Bacchides* 254–7)

In (7), Hegio interrogates Tyndarus, his prisoner. The antecedent is a polar question, and the echo response is realised by echoing the main verb. The question particle is, expectedly, omitted, and the person marker is converted ($2^{nd} > 1^{st}$ person singular), otherwise the echo response (*fuisti*) would make no sense. The tense is preserved. The rest of the sentence answer—*liber*—is omitted, since it is recoverable from the antecedent.

In (8), the antecedent is a repair. Since the repair is itself a reactive move, most of the sentence answer is omitted already, including the main verb. The echo response is realised by repeating the conjunction and the proper name, that is, the entire antecedent, with an interposition of the intensifier *inquam*.

These two examples are intended to show that all parts of speech can be echoed and that a verb need not be one of them. Apart from verbs, the following parts of speech are echoed across the corpus: nouns, pronouns (all types), adjectives, adverbs, and particles.

(b) How much of the antecedent is repeated. Another variable is the length of the echo response. One finds responses where one word is echoed, as in (7), two words, as in (8), or any number of words, as in (9).

(9)   *Alcumena: [...] estne haec patera qua donatu's illi?*
       *Amphitruo: summe Iuppiter, quid ego video? **haec** ea **est** profecto **patera**. perii, Sosia.*

'Isn't this the bowl you were presented with there?—Great Jupiter, what do I see? That is indeed the bowl. I'm done for, Sosia.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 780–1)

Amphitruo is trying to convince Alcumena that he is seeing her for the first time that day. Alcumena, convinced they had interacted already, does not believe him, since she had received a golden bowl as a present from him, which she now produces as proof (neither of them knows, however, that they had been victims of a ruse by Jupiter, disguised as Amphitruo). The antecedent is again a polar question, but this time several elements are echoed, not only those which are strictly necessary.[35]

(c) How faithfully the relevant elements are repeated. On the morphological level, elements of the antecedent are rarely echoed exactly as they are because of the necessary conversions of person markers and expected omissions of question markers, such as *-ne* (or the variant *-n*). Both changes are demonstrated by (7) above. These may be referred to as conversions.

There are, however, many more possible changes, which are pragmatically motivated. These include intensifying prefixes and intensifying particles (*negas?—pernego immo*[36]), changes in tense (*valen?...—...valui...*[37]), changes in voice (*...ut detis—dabitur*[38]), and changes in mood (*...eo...—eas...*[39]). This type of non-mandatory, pragmatically motivated changes may be referred to as modifications. While grammatical conversions are very predictable, pragmatically motivated modifications are less so.

The main reason for studying the form of the echo response is to determine, to what extent it was free and to what extent it was constrained, which should lead to a better description of the echo response as a linguistic resource.

The variability of the echo response outlined above—this variability, it is worth noting, refers to the echoed elements only, not to the response as a whole (which is itself subject to variability)—produces an unmanageable set of combinations, and studying each of them would result in statistically insignificant subsets. In the following, I attempt to reduce the number of possible combinations by establishing formal categories, which in my view, will be most useful

---

[35] I adduce this example here to demonstrate the formal flexibility of the echo response. In Section 4.2.2 of Chapter 4 I discuss the same example from a pragmatic point of view, to demonstrate the need to differentiate between an act of repetition and the echo response as a grammatical category.
[36] Plautus, *Aulularia* 764–765.
[37] Plautus, *Trinummus* 50.
[38] Plautus, *Menaechmi* 1155.
[39] Plautus, *Rudens* 403.

in describing the echo response. This potentially entails some loss, since some idiosyncrasies might be missed, but this should be offset by the qualitative study in each analytic chapter. Additionally, efforts were made to ensure transparency and traceability, so that the set of categories can be updated for other studies.

As all other sets of categories in this study, the set of formal categories was determined both deductively and inductively, that is, based on the information on the echo response in other languages discussed in the previous sections, and on the specificity of the corpus observed upon close reading. I choose the following categories:

1. Verb in active indicative
2. Verb in passive indicative
3. Verb in non-indicative
4. Pronoun
5. Pronoun + verb
6. Particle
7. Particle + verb
8. Long repetition
9. Other

Verb in indicative. This category is the most basic. Modern echo-based languages, such as Welsh and other Celtic languages, Cantonese, Czech, Finnish, Latvian, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, or Thai, are based on echoing the finite verb (Jones 1999: 51). By hypothesis, I assume that that will also be the case in Latin. While I expect most cases to echo the main finite verb, it is important to note here that I include into this category any finite verb, as long as it is central to the illocutionary intent by Speaker 1, such as in (10):

(10)   *Phaedria: at nunc dicam quod lubenter audias.*
         Dorio: **loquere, audio**.
         'But I'm about to say something you'll be glad to hear.—Speak. I'm listening.'
         (Terence, *Phormio* 488)

The antecedent (expression of intention) contains two verbs, the main verb *dicam*, as well as *audias* in the object clause. Pragmatically speaking, the main verb expresses intention, while *audias* is a part of a strategy to make Dorio more receptive to the content to be conveyed. In (6) above, the non-main verb set up the condition under which the exchange may continue (*fidem*

da), which had to be addressed (*fidem do*). This case is different in that the non-main verb is a pragmatic strategy, which need not be addressed. However, Dorio still addresses it, which demonstrates another way in which randomness can creep into the echo response: as long as mandatory elements are addressed by Speaker 2, such as promises not to divulge information, there is no way to predict how many, if any, non-mandatory elements will be addressed. In a future study, devoted entirely to the echo response, this should be a fruitful venue to pursue, namely studying pragmatic conditions under which Speaker 2 chooses which verbs of the antecedent to echo. Since the echo response will, by hypothesis, be acceptable no matter which verb from the antecedent ends up as the main verb in the echo response, I leave this out of consideration for now. In (10), Dorio echoes both verbs. Since *loquere* is the substitute echo response, which is not a part of this study, I only consider the verb *audio*.

This category also includes cases where the verb is echoed with tense modified. The decision to make 'verb in passive indicative' a separate category, but not 'verb with tense modified', is not obvious, but has been taken based on the fact that verbs with the voice modified are more frequent than those with the tense modified and should yield better results.

The expectation is that for the cases of the echo response which are not echoed in active indicative, pragmatic reasons can be identified. Other categories were chosen partly based on frequency (to make it possible to identify trends), and partly based on the likelihood of correlation with other variables studied here (such as sociolinguistic factors).

Verb in indicative with voice modified. This category includes all cases where the verb is echoed with a voice modification. I expect this to correlate with the social status of participants (since I am interested in Speaker 2's choice to *modify* the voice, any cases where both verbs, in the antecedent and in the response, are in passive, are included in the category 'Verb in indicative', discussed above).

Verb in non-indicative. This category includes all cases, where the relevant verb of the antecedent is echoed, but is not in indicative. It can be in any imperative or any subjunctive. I expect these choices to mostly occur after action antecedents, since non-indicatives are incompatible with information antecedents (reporting facts which have the status of information), and naturally compatible with action antecedents (expressing future or potential states of affairs, which do not have the status of information). Verbs in non-indicative are likely to correlate with sociolinguistic factors as well.

Pronoun. Moving on to non-verbal echoes, this category includes all cases where the pronoun of the antecedent is echoed. The pronoun may be of any type (personal, possessive, demonstrative, etc.), in any case. I expect this to reflect the general understanding of the behaviour of the echo response in literature (see Section 4.1 of Chapter 4): if only a part of the utterance is questioned, that part is repeated. This could be expected to represent unmarked usage. An interesting question regarding the pronominal echo, which represents a significant share of the total number of echo responses (and positive responses *tout court*) in the corpus, is whether or not they were inherently emphatic. The pronominal echo responses should occur frequently after repairs, which, due to the negative bias, require a pragmatically strong positive response. I also expect the artistic language/theatre-speak of the Roman comedy to play a significant role here, for instance, in creating humorous dialogue or tension (Müller 1997: 192 recognises pronominal responses as '*Mittel, Spannung in den Dialog zu bringen*').

Pronoun + verb. While in the previous category only the pronoun is echoed, in this category I include cases where a pronoun is echoed together with the verb. If responding by a pronoun creates tension in the dialogue—presumably because of the brusque effect of the short response as well as the (unconsciously?) surprising absence of the verb—then it should be interesting to observe, whether *pronoun + verb* echoes are any different in this respect, since the response is slightly longer, and the verb is not absent. If this category is a 'softer' version of the previous category (because it is longer and less abrupt), this should correlate with the social status of the speaker.

Particle. This category includes cases where a particle, such as *ita*, *etiam*, etc., is echoed. Since one of the aims of this study is to describe positive response particles in Latin, studying contexts, where the echo response and particles come together, is the logical step. Since one of the intriguing questions regarding positive response particles is in what contexts they develop, it should be interesting to observe whether the context of particle echo responses had any role in facilitating or even encouraging the development of such particles into positive response particles.

Particle + verb. This category includes cases where a particle is echoed together with the verb. The motivation for this category is similar to the one for the category *pronoun + verb*, that is, to study any pragmatic differences between responses which echo bare particles and those which include the verb.

Longer repetition. This category is hard to define. Cases where the positive response is identical to the antecedent are rare, not least due to the mandatory grammatical conversions, but especially due to frequent pragmatically motivated modifications. So with rare exceptions, there is really no such thing as a perfect echo response. But there are many which clearly echo more than necessary for the provision of polarity. One cannot deny that there is a difference between occurrences where two or three words are echoed and those where almost everything from the antecedent is echoed. In order to look for pragmatic motivations for these redundant repetitions, this category includes cases where more of the antecedent is echoed than usual. Based on the decision not to systematically study intensifiers in the echo response (see above), it also includes cases with non-echoed intensifiers, as long as redundant elements of the antecedent are present.

Other. This is a catch-all category and includes, first of all, those occurrences which are not captured by any other category, such as echoed adverbs (*certen?—certe*[40]), echoed phrases and nominal echoes. Their token values are typically too low to allow tracing a trend, but may be of some interest on an individual basis.

3.3.2   Non-echo responses

While the echo response is, due to its unpredictability, hard to capture in a set of analytic categories, this should be easier for the non-echo responses. The non-echo responses are all those responses which, instead of repeating some material from the antecedent, introduce into the response a new word, not formally related to any part of the antecedent (see Chapter 5 for references). If, in the case of the echo response, the semantic load of confirmation or agreement is 'located' on the act of repetition, rather than on a specific lexeme, in non-echo responses it is located on a specific lexical material in the response. In other words, in the echo response, the confirmation-bearing material is such by virtue of being repeated, while in the non-echo responses the confirmation-bearing material is 'confirmative' on semantic grounds, that is, it was such before being used in an utterance in question—the typical representatives are positive response particles.

In this section, I establish such a set of descriptive categories as will be the most likely to reveal the state of development of positive response particles in Latin. In order to keep the study manageable, I only focus on five non-echo responses: *ita*, *sic*, *fiat*, *licet*, and *etiam*. Since the

---

[40] Terence, *Hecyra* 843.

set of potential realisations of the non-echo responses is much narrower than that of the echo response, this should be more straightforward. Still, these strategies show different degrees of formal variability, and variability is not necessarily comparable for the five of them, so a unique set of categories will not be possible:

- While for *licet*, a verb, one might expect variability in terms of tense, voice, and mood, no variability is attested in the corpus;
- *Fiat* has limited variability in terms of tense (see Section 5.2.3 of Chapter 5); it also co-occurs with *ita* in its primary function of anaphoric adverb);
- *Ita* and *sic*, on the other hand, do not enter the positive response system as particles, but as an anaphoric and a deictic adverb, respectively; in fact, the most intriguing property of *ita* and *sic* in the corpus is that they occur in positive responses both in their primary and in secondary function (see sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 of Chapter 5); consequently, one encounters them either bare or with a more or less limited set of verbs (on a phrase level), or in longer constructions (on a clause level);
- Except for two constructions with *immo*, *etiam* displays no formal variability which could be studied quantitatively.

Since *licet* does not vary, I leave it out of consideration in this section. I also leave out *fiat* and *etiam*, since their variability is so minimal that they can be easily handled in their dedicated sections. In the following paragraphs, then, I choose a set of formal categories for *ita*- and *sic*-responses.

Based on the occurrences encountered in the corpus, I form the following set of categories.

1. Bare
2. With *est*
3. With verb
4. With intensifier
5. Longer construction

Bare. This is the basic category. It is the main reason to suspect that *ita* and *sic* might have been formally fixed positive response strategies, comparable with such particles as *yes* in English. In terms of diachronic development, this would represent the end stage (as long as some other basic properties were also present).

With est. This category is important because it represents a possible stage of development of *ita* and *sic* as positive response particles. I base this prediction on the assumption that *ita/sic* and *ita est/sic est* are exactly equivalent. Since *est* would, semantically speaking, not contribute anything to the response (and conversely, for bare *ita/sic* to work, it has to be presupposed), it is likely to be omitted. In terms of development, the *bare/with est* ratio should be a good indicator whether either of these two candidate strategies was a positive response particle at the time represented by the corpus.

With verb. Since *ita* and *sic* are liable to occur in a positive response in their primary function of an anaphoric/deictic adverb, they are frequently found co-occurring with a set of verbs which are semantically compatible with a positive response. Some of these constructions provide more than polarity: they may be considered *evidentials* or *hedges*; *ita videtur*,[41] for instance, does not commit the utterer to the truth of the reported state of affairs in the same way *ita/ita est* does. These occurrences again raise questions connected with the development of positive response particles. While not necessarily a direct pre-stage, such constructions may have increased the likelihood of *ita* and *sic* occurring in positive responses and thus contributed to their *entrenchment* (Langacker 1987: 59–60) in the minds of speakers of Latin. In this scenario, constructions such as *ita est* and *ita dico* would mutually reinforce each other and ensure continued propagation of *ita* in positive responses, until the one which was closest to providing no more and no less than the positive polarity won out. The same could, by hypothesis, apply to *sic*-responses.

With intensifier. As discussed in the introduction to this section, one of the main properties of a positive response particle is its non-emphatic status. This can be gauged primarily by observing the antecedent (some of which, such as repairs, are more likely to be followed by an emphatic positive response strategy). However, this category should make it possible to see whether the presence of an intensifier might be another way to assess the inherent emphasis— with the assumption that non-emphatic particles do not need intensifiers.

Longer construction. This category includes occurrences where *ita* and *sic* are incorporated into a formulation longer than *ita/sic + verb*; examples are *ita res est*[42] and *profecto ut loquor res ita est*[43].

---

[41] Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 599.
[42] Plautus, *Asinaria* 490.
[43] Plautus, *Amphitruo* 569.

3.4 Antecedent

Responses are only responses when paired with a question or another antecedent: they are 'second of a dyad of utterances'; '[an answer] is determined pragmatically, usually by the nature of the information sought (Brown *et al.* 2009: 514); 'Answer' is a relational category: it has to be defined with reference to the category of 'question' (Sorjonen 2001: 33); 'by reference to a prior utterance, [the positive response strategies] offer an analysis of it (Sorjonen 2010: 277).

While it is commonplace to state that a response depends on the question, or, more generally, antecedent, it is also true that its formulation is constrained by factors well beyond antecedent, such as conversational setting, interactants and the relationship between them, common ground, and others (see Levinson 1983: 284–5). It is hard or impossible to integrate all of these factors into a single presentation. For the sake of clarity, I shall temporarily suspend some findings on the nature of conversation, established in the field of Conversation analysis, and, for the purposes of this study, often treat *antecedent—positive response strategy* pairs as though they were independent from the context. The advantage of focussing on one heuristic at a time is that it allows studying all positive response strategies on equal terms (as long as a heuristic is relevant for a particular strategy), but also that it is replicable. If it turns out that the set of antecedents proposed here is not precise enough and does not provide all the information predicted in Section 3.2.3, it can be easily modified. Pragmatic and interactional aspects are then taken into account on an individual basis.

The type of antecedent should be one of the most important heuristics for studying the positive response system of Latin. For the echo response, it should indicate whether it was the default positive response strategy, that is, useful in a wide range of contexts; it should indicate the degree of its inherent emphasis; and finally, it should reveal how or to what extent the focal element of the antecedent determines the form of the echo response. For the non-echo responses, it should again indicate their degree of inherent emphasis; and finally, it should indicate whether they have the property of providing nothing more than polarity.

The results of my preliminary analysis, reported in Potočnik (2023), show a rough division of labour between the echo response and the non-echo responses. The echo response can respond to any antecedent type, while the non-echo responses studied there (*ita* and *sic*) are mostly limited to questions and statements. This led to the conclusion that the echo response was the primary positive response strategy in Latin, while the (alleged) positive response particles were

not fully functional, such as modern positive response particles, like *yes*, are. The division of labour between the positive response strategies corresponds quite closely to the division between speech acts proposed in literature. Risselada (1993: 36) proposes two main criteria for distinguishing speech acts, the 'orientation'—that is, who the speech act involves—and 'what the speech act is about': facts, emotions, or actions. The results of the investigation in Potočnik (2023) indicate that the positive response particles *ita* and *sic* can respond to facts, but usually not to references to emotions or actions, whereas the echo response can be used in any environment.[44]

The division of labour also maps straightforwardly on the division made by Halliday (1984: 11)—the proposal, which I came across after the publication of Potočnik (2023). The author, treating dialogue as an exchange, identifies two variables: 'the roles determined by the process' and 'the commodity being exchanged'. The commodity can be either 'goods-&-services' or 'information'. To illustrate with examples (from Halliday 1984: 11):

(11)   Give me a Herald, please!

          Let me fix it for you!

          Is it cold outside?

          I met Colin today.

In the first utterance, a service is demanded; in the second, a service is offered; the third, on the other hand, demands information, and the fourth offers information. In the first two utterances, language serves as the 'means of furthering the exchange', whereas in the second two utterances, 'language is both the means of exchange and the manifestation of the commodity being exchanged' (*ibid.*).

The results of my investigation suggest that, in Latin, the echo response can respond to all four utterances, whereas *ita* and *sic* can only respond to the second pair, as shown by the following pair of examples:

(12)   *Amphitruo: In eodem lecto?*

          Alcumena: **In eodem**.

          [also acceptable: *ita*/*sic*]

          'On the same couch?—Yes, on the same.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 805)

---

[44] See also Haverkate's (1979) distinction between interpersonal and propositional acts.

(13)   *Simo: I nunciam intro, ne in mora, quom opus sit, sies.*

           *Pamphilus: **Eo**.*

           [not acceptable: *ita*/*sic*]

           'Go inside now, so you won't keep us waiting when we need you.—I am going.' (Terence, *Andria* 424)

The exchanges in (12) and (13) are both attested; in square brackets, I added a non-attested, but according to my results, a plausible alternative response. In (12), the service demanded is information, and the positive response can be realised by either the echo response or particles. In (13), a service is demanded, and the only way to agree to it being carried out is by the echo response. *Ita* and *sic* would not be acceptable.

The division between the two types of commodities proposed by Halliday is attractive, especially considering what the author states subsequently: 'as a general feature, languages display a greater tendency to congruence[45] in the exchange of information than in the exchange of goods-&-services' (Halliday 1984: 19–20). The positive response particles seem generally to crystallise in exchanges of information, whereas no specialised particles for the exchange of goods-&-services are usually needed. At the next stage of development, the use of the information-oriented positive response particles is sometimes expanded to the contexts of goods-&-services (possible exceptions are *alright* in English and *fiat* and *licet*, considered in sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 of Chapter 5).

I take this division of labour and its reflection in the literature on speech acts as the starting point for the expanded and more detailed investigation undertaken here.

3.4.1   Information antecedents

This group of antecedent types pertains to states of affairs and their descriptions or, in other words, 'facts (and opinions about facts)' (Risselada 1993: 38). Typical representatives are questions and statements. Based on the discussion in sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of this chapter, I include repairs as a separate category.

Polar question. This antecedent type mostly corresponds to the less technical term 'yes-no question' or, in terms of the sentence types in König and Siemund (2010: 292), 'polar

---

[45] 'A 'congruent' realization is that one which can be regarded as typical—which will be selected in the absence of any good reason for selecting another one' (Halliday 1984:14).

interrogative'. However, in communicative reality, requesting confirmation need not be limited to this sentence type, since situational factors might demand a more indirect framing, such as:

(14)   I was wondering whether the novel was based on real events. (invented)

Even though the utterance in (14) is of a declarative sentence type, the utterer produced it in order to obtain information, which makes it functionally equivalent to the interrogative sentence type.

In terms of their pairing with a positive response strategy, the defining characteristic of polar questions is that they expect a response. Holmberg (2016: 13) shows that polar questions are semantic equivalents of disjunctive statements, containing two possibilities. 'Do you want tea?' has the same value as 'You want tea, or you do not want tea.' The function of a positive response strategy is to select the positive element of the two, thus filling the information gap signalled by the utterer. In the words of Jones (1999: 6), a positive response strategy provides the truth value of a proposition. In most discussions of positive response strategies, the adjacency pair *polar question—response* is, implicitly or explicitly, considered the primary environment. In most cases, this is the only environment analysed (e.g., Jones 1999, Armstrong 2008; Sorjonen 2001 is an exception). As suggested by Schegloff (1972: 77), even though other sequences (i.e., adjacency pairs), are found empirically, they are best analysed as modifications of this basic sequence. In a sense then, all other uses of positive response strategies after polar questions could be considered secondary developments of the pair *polar question—response*.

Looking at it from the point of view of the positive response strategy, the request for confirmation creates a sequential implication (Sorjonen 2001: 33), so that the following turn can be (but is not necessarily) interpreted as a response.

Now, even though the illocutionary intent of the polar question is quite clear—obtaining confirmation of a proposition—placing attested occurrences into this antecedent type is often not straightforward. Consider the following two examples ((16) was also discussed in Potočnik 2023: 80):

(15)   *Leonida: […]* **meministine asinos Arcadicos mercatori Pelleo**
         nostrum vendere atriensem?
         Libanus: memini. quid tum postea?
         Leonida: em ergo is argentum huc remisit quod daretur Saureae pro asinis.
         […]

'Do you remember that our steward sold donkeys from Arcadia to a merchant from Pella?—I do. What next?—Well then, he sent money back here to be given to Saurea for the donkeys.' (Plautus, *Asinaria* 333–7)

(16)   *Eutychus: [...] quanto te satiust rus aliquo abire, ibi esse, ibi vivere*

      adeo dum illius te cupiditas atque amor missum facit?

      Charinus: **iam dixisti?**

      Eutychus: dixi.

      '[…] how much better is it for you to go somewhere in the country, remain there, and live there until your desire and love for her lets go of you?—Have you finished speaking now?—I have finished speaking.' (Plautus, *Mercator* 655–8)

In both cases, the requests for confirmation receive a positive response and, at the most basic level, the illocution of requesting a piece of information is present. It is, however, equally clear, that that is not the only illocutionary force. In (15), Leonida's question is only a pre-expansion[46] to his real intent: to inform Libanus that the money for the donkeys sold has been received. In this sense, the question has an anaphoric (pointing to a referent—the donkeys—present in the co-interactants' common ground), as well as a discourse-initiating function, and obtaining information in the strict sense is not Leonida's first priority, as is also evident from the fact that he does not expect a response: if Libanus had said nothing, Leonida would be perfectly free to continue his story and the absence of confirmation would not be noticeable. This is even clearer in (16), where the illocutionary force of Charinus' question is not to obtain information, but rather urging Eutychus to stop talking. In this case, too, the absence of the positive response would not be noticeable, since Charinus would be satisfied with silence.[47]

The illocution, then, has to be determined on a case-by-case basis and it since we do not have access to the minds of the speakers of Latin, it is frequently unresolvable. In Potočnik (2023) such cases were classified as 'Other indirect speech acts'. In this expanded investigation, I

---

[46] A term used in Conversation Analysis. While an adjacency pair (a communicative move by Speaker 1 and a response to it by Speaker 2) is the basic constituent part of conversation, many conversations include expansions of this basic unit, for instance, to ensure that conditions for the main illocutionary intent of the communicative move are met. In this case, Leonida first makes sure that Libanus has the necessary background knowledge. Other types of expansions are insert expansion (such as repair, discussed in this section) and post-expansion. See Schegloff (2007) for a comprehensive introduction and examples.

[47] This case, incidentally, demonstrates the issue, frequently pointed out in literature on speech acts, about the close relationship between questions and directives; see, e.g., Brown *et al.* (2009: 493). Since a question is essentially a directive to provide an answer, Searle (1979: 14) even considers them a speech act distinct from directives. See Risselada (1993: 40) for more useful references.

categorise such utterances as polar questions. It may turn out that there is an interplay between the illocution and sentence type which triggers a certain positive response strategy. So rather than ignored, alternative illocutions in such cases should be considered merely suspended. For the same, reason, special cases, such as rhetorical questions which receive a response for a humorous effect, are also included here.

Repair. Sometimes the addressee mishears, misunderstands, or does not hear an utterance at all. In cases of differences in the background knowledge, the addressee might find the information received surprising, which might lead them to believe they have misheard. For such cases, a device is in place, usually referred to as *repair initiator* or *repair*.[48] A repair is a move with which the co-interactant 'articulates a best guess or candidate understanding of an element in the coparticipant's prior utterance' (Sorjonen 2001: 58). The function of a repair therefore tends be requesting confirmation (of the 'candidate understanding'), but also expression of surprise, disapproval, critique, and others.[49]

A repair can be realised in many ways, as the following examples show:

(17)   I lost my job.—You what?/You?/What?/Huh?/What do you mean, lost?
         (invented)

(18)   *Mnesilochus: quia patri omne cum ramento reddidi.*
         *Chrysalus: **reddidisti**?*
         Mnesilochus: reddidi.
         'Because I've returned everything to my father, including the last scrap.—
         You've returned it?' (Plautus, *Bacchides* 68–681)

In the corpus, it is frequently realised by the echo question,[50] as in (18), where the co-interactant repeats the focal element of the preceding move, that is, the surprising element or the element which is suspected to have been misheard.[51] As an antecedent, then, the echo question is not distinct from the polar question, except for its place in the ongoing interaction. While a polar question is the first part of a dyad (the response being the second part), as in (19), the repair initiator is the second move in an exchange containing at least three moves, as in (20):

---

[48] See Levinson (1983: 339–42) and especially Schegloff (2007: 100–6) for useful introductions; see Sorjonen (2001: 58–64) for a discussion of positive responses to a repair in Finnish.
[49] Brown *et al.* (2009: 508) state that echo questions typically function as a critique or refutation of that previous discourse segment. They presumably proceed from a formal categorisation, rather than functional.
[50] See König and Siemund (2007) for a discussion of the echo question as a sentence type.
[51] See Brown *et al.* (2009: 508–9) for formal realisations of echo questions in Latin.

(19)   A: **polar question**

        B: response

(20)   A: initiating move

        B: **repair**

        A: response

        B: reactive move

Even though the repair is realised by a polar question—and one can consider the second and third move as an adjacency pair in itself—repairs must be considered a separate type of antecedent, because of the kind of positive responses they tend to invite. If the information in the initiating move is surprising, it is reasonable to assume that, upon receiving a surprised reaction of the co-interactant, Speaker 1 will confirm their initial statement more emphatically. Cross-linguistic findings confirm that (see sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of this chapter). Treating repairs as a separate type of antecedent is thus crucial to studying the inherent level of emphasis in both echo and non-echo responses.

Additionally, positive response strategies frequently start their development from emphatic expressions[52] and that is likely the case with *ita* and *sic* (see sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 of Chapter 5 and Thesleff 1960: 27). In this sense, their occurrence after repairs might indicate their stage of development on the trajectory *emphatic > less emphatic > non-emphatic*, which applies to many positive response particles across languages.

Due to ample attestation, I chose the environment of repair to observe emphasis in positive responses. It should be noted, however, that there are other environments which are likely to elicit emphatic reactions. In the following example, Mercury challenges Sosia by a negatively biased provocative question. The question and the response, in terms of Conversation Analysis, constitute a post-expansion (see Schegloff 2007). Since the question is, just like repairs, negatively biased, it requires an emphatic response. The emphasis is provided by an intensifier.

(21)   *Mercurius: servosne <es> an liber?*

        Sosia: utquomque animo collibitum est meo.

        *Mercurius: **ain vero?***

        Sosia: aio enim vero.

---

[52] *Kyllä* '[originally] very' in Finnish; *yes* is thought to have originally been used to respond to negatively biased questions; see Wallage and Van der Wurff (2013).

> ‘Are you a slave or free?—Whichever I like.—Do you say so?—Yes, I say so indeed.’ (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 344)

However, since examples of such exchanges in my corpus are not frequent enough to lend themselves to systematic study, they are left out of the account here.

Statement. This type of antecedent is mostly associated with the declarative sentence type, but can be expressed by the interrogative and exclamative type as well (e.g., expressions of emotion).

While polar questions seek the missing polarity, that is, they overtly seek information, statements offer information and as such do not seek a response as polar questions do (the responsibility for the information asserted, in other words, is on the side of the speaker, not of the addressee; Risselada 1993: 38). I consider this the main distinguishing quality of the statement as an antecedent category.

The fact that it does not seek a response has an important implication for further talk, best explained in terms of Conversation Analysis. As opposed to addressing a polar interrogative to someone—which is an act of speaker-designation—the utterer of the statement does not select the next speaker. The next speaker has to self-designate, for which a range of linguistic strategies exist, which are referred to as turn-taking strategies;[53] as will be shown in this study, positive response strategies play an important role in this function.

However, not every speaking turn is an attempt to take the conversational floor from the current speaker. In the natural flow of conversation, co-interactants regularly show their participation in the conversation by providing feedback to the listener. Just like turn-taking strategies, every language has conventionalized feedback strategies,[54] both verbal and non-verbal, such as *mhm* and nods. One need only think how many times one uttered *mhm* or similar during the most recent conversation to realise that feedback is an essential part of being a listener and a co-interactant and that positive response strategies play an important role here as well, due to their convenient shortness—linguistic feedback has be to perceptible, but not too intrusive—as well as their content, since a positive evaluation is probably going to be well received by the co-interactant.

---

[53] See Sacks *et al.* (1974) for the classic paper on organising talk in conversation; see Müller (1997) for the first application to Latin; see Berger (2020a and 2020b) for a recent application and further literature.
[54] See Allwood *et al.* (1992) for a semantic-pragmatic account.

Proceeding from the point of view of the nature of the positive response, then, there is a fundamental difference between the positive response strategy in response to a polar question—providing missing information—and the positive response strategy in response to a statement—voluntarily providing information, which has little to do with information and everything to do with the act of conversation as a social activity.

3.4.2   Action Antecedents

While information antecedents have to do with 'speech acts about facts', according to the division in Risselada (1993: 37–45), the action antecedents correspond to 'speech acts about actions'. The most typical representatives are directives, which are also the most amply attested in the corpus. Since what I will refer to as 'minor types of action antecedents' (i.e., action antecedents other than directives) are less well attested, I do not expect to be able to observe significant tendencies in terms of what types of positive response strategies they can trigger (except for the obvious ones, such as the fact that offers are most likely to be responded to by the imperative echo responses). While interpretation in terms of which speech act a certain utterance belongs to was kept to a minimum, it could not be avoided entirely, as the main criterion of distinction is still the illocutionary intent. Efforts were made to ascertain the state of mind of the speaker to a degree of reasonable certainty.[55] Thus, while information antecedents were chosen based on their analytic potential (for instance, the important division between polar questions and repairs), the set of action antecedents, chosen for this study, is also based on the availability. Even though, for this study, my expectations regarding the trends which minor antecedents may reveal are limited, the data may be useful for future studies.

Directive. While Risselada includes straightforward orders, but also requests, pieces of advice, suggestions, and proposals (see Risselada 1993: 45–9), I designate as directives only the speech acts where the control of the state of affairs in question is on the side of Speaker 1. The required state of affairs is an accomplishment of some action in the future.

Other future action antecedent types are much less frequent than directives, so I include all those encountered in the corpus (which also receive a positive response), with minimal effort to classify them.

---

[55] 'Criteria that are based on the actual intentions of the speaker, on the other hand, are the least "checkable" ones, because we do not have access to the speaker's mind to reveal his psychological state or his purposes in performing a particular speech act.' (Risselada 1993: 35 on speech act types).

Asking for commitment. Demands for commitment from Speaker 2 include asking for promises with varying degrees of intensity, from asking for promises and betrothals to seeking assurance that an action will be completed. This category, notably, includes promises, so it should reveal whether the cross-linguistically attested tendency towards the echo response in this context[56] is also reflected in Latin.

Wish. Expressions of wishes are those antecedents, where Speaker 1 does not control the state of affairs entirely. They frequently include verbs such as *volo* or *lubet*. It should be noted that this type of antecedent includes actual wishes, rather than politely phrased directives (the latter are included in the directive antecedents).

Intention. Expressions of intention are those antecedents where Speaker 1, who may or may not control the state of affairs, expresses an intention to perform an action.

Request for permission. Requests for permission are those interrogative antecedents which usually feature the verb *licet*. Speaker 1 does not control the state of affairs.

Question on future action. Questions on future action are either repairs uttered by Speaker 2 upon hearing a directive ('action counterparts' to repairs discussed in Section 3.4.1 of this chapter) or sincere questions regarding the course of action desired by the co-interactant. This type also includes offers, i.e., antecedents which propose an action. In the latter case, Speaker 1 tends to be a person who does not control the state of affairs. They are associated with the expression *vin*.

3.5 Parts of a response

Jones, discussing the Welsh answering system from the point of view of semantics, starts by observing that the answer to a polar question can be given by a corresponding positive or negative statement (Jones 1999: 1; see also Holmberg 2016: 13). This corresponding statement is the so-called *sentence answer*, a term which was introduced by Bäuerle (1979: 63). Consider the example in (22).

(22)   Is it raining?
    a. It is raining.
    b. It is.

---

[56] With exceptions, such as marriage vows in German, where the response *ja* is acceptable according to Vennemann (2009).

    c.   Yes.

    d.   Yes, it is raining.

    e.   Yes, it is.

    f.   A lot.

    g.   It is raining, a lot.

    h.   It is, a lot.

    i.   Yes, it is raining, a lot.

    j.   Yes, it is, a lot.

    k.   Yes, a lot.

This example is adapted from Jones (1999: 1–2) and represents many (but not all) possible answers to the question *Is it raining?* Answer (a) is the sentence answer—an affirmative version of the proposition in question. The sentence answer can be, and mostly is, elided, which yields (b). It is of course possible to respond to the polar question simply by *yes*, as in (c), which is semantically equivalent to the sentence answer. *Yes* can, importantly, combine with both versions of the sentence answer, yielding (d) and (e).

If *yes* and the sentence answer have the same semantic value and if they can either occur independently or co-occur, it is possible to represent them in terms of two positions, which I shall, for the purposes of this discussion, refer to as [particle] position and [sentence] position. An important characteristic of these positions is that they need not be explicit, but are always present; I shall represent this fact by the ± sign: [±particle][±sentence]. The responses (a)–(e) can thus be represented as follows:

    a.   It is raining: [-particle][+sentence]

    b.   It is: [-particle][+sentence]

    c.   Yes: [+particle][-sentence]

    d.   Yes, it is raining: [+particle][+sentence]

    e.   Yes, it is: [+particle][+sentence]

The answers (a)–(e) are semantically equivalent, i.e., they carry no more and no less than the value of positive polarity. Whether both the [particle] and the [sentence] position are expressed, depends on pragmatic factors, studied in chapters 4, 5 and 6, but has no bearing on the truth of the proposition: of the responses (d) and (e), neither is 'more true' than the other.

Since anything can be an answer, even a polar question, seeking polarity—which can be provided by either a sentence answer or a positive response particle—can be answered in an infinite number of ways. Thus, it is possible to respond to the question in (22) by (f), which provides the information on how much it is raining. This response clearly does not fit into the two positions above. First of all, it provides something other than a confirmation—it answers the question how much it is raining. To represent this response, it is necessary to add another position—I shall call it [additional], since this information is additional to the information sought by the antecedent. Since it is possible to say how much it is raining, it is clear that the response also provided the confirmation. This explains why the polarity positions [±particle] and [±sentence] positions must be present, even if not expressed: for the response in (f) to be valid, the confirmation must be implied (see Jones 1999: 15).[57] Even though, technically, one of them would suffice for the answer to be true, we shall keep both, which might prove useful in discussing the relationship between the sentence answer and the positive response particle. The answer (f) can thus be represented as follows:

f. A lot: [-particle][-sentence][+additional]

The responses (g)–(k) represent the possible permutations of the three parameters, reflecting the fact that either [±particle] or [±sentence] or both are always assumed to accompany [±additional], but are not necessarily explicit.

g. It is raining, a lot: [-particle][+sentence][+additional]
h. It is, a lot: [-particle][+sentence][+additional]
i. Yes, it is raining, a lot: [+particle][+sentence][+additional]
j. Yes, it is, a lot: [+particle][+sentence][+additional]
k. Yes, a lot: [+particle][-sentence][+additional]

Which of these are present, depends on pragmatic factors.

From all of the above it follows that any positive response to a polar question has three possible components. How do these positions help to make sense of the variety of possible positive response strategies found in the corpus? Let us look at an example.

(23)   *Lysiteles: Adulescenti huic genere summo, amico atque aequali meo, minus qui*
          caute et cogitate suam rem tractavit, pater, bene volo ego illi facere, si tu non

---

[57] Cf. the implicit positive response strategy (Section 2.4 of Chapter 2).

nevis.

Philto: Nemp' de tuo?

Lysiteles: **De meo***: nam quod tuom est meum est, omne meum est autem tuom.*
'If you're not against it, father, I want to do a good turn to this young chap
from a family of the highest standing, a friend and contemporary of mine, who
hasn't handled his affairs very cautiously and thoughtfully.—You mean from
your own funds, don't you?—Yes, from my own funds: what belongs to you
belongs to me, and everything that belongs to me belongs to you in turn.'
(Plautus, *Trinummus* 327–9)

In (23), Lysiteles confirms Philto's question by echoing the relevant part of the information
from the antecedent. The echo response can be thought of as the heavily elided version of the
sentence answer: [±sentence]. [±particle] is not expressed; indeed, in the corpus, [±sentence]
and [±particle] co-occur only exceptionally (see, e.g., Section 5.2.1 of Chapter 5). In English
—and in other languages of the European linguistic area?—the combination of both is, in this
case, often more felicitous than [±sentence] alone, as exemplified also by the translation, which
features both *yes* and the echo response. In terms the template above, the answer could be
represented by the following template:

[-particle][+sentence][+additional]

(24)   *Nicobulus: Eho tu, <scelus,> loquitatusne es gnato meo male per sermonem,
        quia mi id aurum reddidit, et te dixisti id aurum ablaturum tamen per
        sycophantiam?*
        Chrysalus: Egone istuc dixi?
        Nicobolus: **Ita***.*
        ' Hey, you criminal, so you gave my son bad words for returning that gold to
        me, and you said that you were nevertheless going to take away that gold
        through a trick, didn't you?—I said that?—Yes.' (Plautus, *Bacchides* 803–5)

In (24), the antecedent is a polar question (with a strong intonation of disbelief), to which
Nicobulus responds with the bare particle *ita*. If, hypothetically, the sentence answer were
accompanied by the particle (*ita, tu istuc dixisti*), the semantic value would stay the same. It is
important to note, however, that the templates discussed here operates on the semantic level
and are only meant to illustrate the relationship between the three components of a response;

pragmatically, the force of the utterance would not be the same. The answer could then be represented by the following template:

[+particle][-sentence][-additional]

> (25)   *Sosicles: Mane. Immo equidem memini. Nempe hoc est quod illi dedi. Istuc:*
> *ubi illae armillae sunt quas una dedi?*
> *Ancilla: Numquam dedisti.*
> *Sosicles:* **nam** *pol hoc unum dedi.*
> 'Wait. Yes, I do remember. This is the one I gave her. By the by, tell me: where are those armlets I gave her together with it?—You never gave her any.—Yes, I only gave her this here.' (Plautus, *Menaechmi* 534–7)

The example (25) is more interesting. The antecedent is a statement. Even though there is neither a particle nor a sentence answer, it is clear that Sosicles' answer confirms the statement by the servant girl. As in the response (f), the only way the response in (25) can be true is if there is an assumption of a confirmation, i.e., an implicit positive response strategy:

[-particle][-sentence][+additional]

As shown by the translation, the translator again thought it necessary to supply the sentence with an explicit particle. Considering the number of implicit positive responses in the Plautine and Terentian corpora—259—such cases are evidently not haphazard, but indicate a systematic feature of the positive response system reflected in the corpus, which is different from the common usage in the European linguistic area (where it is limited to specific pragmatic conditions and may sometimes be perceived as 'being short with someone'). This frequency in Plautus and Terence is most likely a feature of the theatre-speak, for instance, to increase the pace of the conversation onstage or to achieve prosodic effects. In other words, the tendency to leave out the provision of polarity probably does not reflect the spoken Latin of the time.[58]

The system described above also allowed Jones (1999) to discuss polarity and truth value of responses. Thus, if in English one wanted to provide a positive response to a negative

---

[58] However, the implicit positive response strategy seems not to have been limited to Plautus and Terence. The following example from Quintilian seems to exemplify a more neutral use: *[…] Filius, qui fortiter eodem proelio fecerat, incolumitatem eius optat: contra dicit pater.' Non enim, inquiunt, mori vult, sed invidiam filio facere* '"[…] His son, who had fought as a hero in the same battle, then asked for his father's pardon as his reward. The father opposes." "He does not want to die," they say, "but only to cause prejudice against his son"' (Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 9.2.85–6).

proposition, one ought to use a sentence answer, which can be accompanied by a particle. Using only a particle would be ambiguous:

(26)   It is not raining, is it?—It is (raining)./Yes, it is (raining)./?Yes.

Responding to a negative proposition reveals a lot about a positive response system; so much that Sadock and Zwicky (1985: 189–91) used it as a criterion in their typology of positive response systems. In this pragmatically oriented study, semantic properties of a positive response strategy will not play a large role. However, the slots introduced here, yield a response template which, should be applicable to any felicitous response to a polar question in English and, to my knowledge, most languages of the European linguistic area, including Latin:

[±particle][±sentence][±additional]

In addition to bringing us some distance from the truism that anything can be an answer, these slots provide a useful template to discuss different components which are found in responses: the provision of polarity as well as additional information. It is rarely the case that Speaker 2 only provides polarity, which is also reflected in the corpus used in this study. The [additional] position is useful in representing the occurrences where no polarity marker is present (see Section 2.3 of Chapter 2). The [sentence] position represents the regular position of the echo response (elided, as needed); the [particle] position represents the position of a positive response particle. Both of these are useful in discussing the relationship between the echo response and the potential positive response particles: a potential positive response particle, such as *ita*, can be thought of as part of the sentence answer, when occurring in its primary function; when it becomes a positive response particle, it 'moves' to the [particle] position; this enables it to co-occur with a sentence answer or with other positive response strategies. In this sense, the position in utterance is a useful information in assessing whether a positive response strategy has made the move to become a positive response particle.

3.5.1   Movement to C-domain

The idea of a positive response moving positions is reflected in syntactic accounts as well. The syntactic account of positive response strategies taken up here has been championed in particular by Holmberg (2013, 2016); the account proposed in Kramer and Rawlins (2011) is based on the same understanding. According to this theory, *yes*- and *no*-responses are derived

by ellipsis from full sentential expressions (Holmberg 2016: 1).[59] Even when they consist of one word only, they have a syntactic structure, which is the same as the syntactic structure of the polar question. The positive response strategies 'are CPs (i.e., complementizer phrases), where the answer particle is in the focus position in the C-domain, with IP (i.e., inflection phrase) elided under identity with the IP of the question' (Holmberg 2016: 52).

What does this mean? First of all, the part of the proposition which is questioned jumps in front of the proposition. In the case of polar questions, this tends to be the finite verb. Since English uses do-substitution to form interrogative and negative versions of affirmative sentences (compare *John drives* vs. *Does John drive?*), it is not convenient for our purposes, so I shall borrow Holmberg's (2016) examples from Finnish.

(27)   *Hajotti-ko Marja ruukun?*
         broke-Q   Marja   the.pot?
         'Did Marja break the pot?' (from Holmberg 2016: 58)

The question in (27) is derived from the affirmative statement *Marja hajoti rukuun* 'Marja broke the pot.' The relevant part of the question, *hajotti*, has been moved to the front and the enclitic *-ko* added (just like *-ne* in Latin, *-ko/-kö* signals a polar question in Finnish):

(28)   [CP *hajotti-ko* [IP *Marja ~~hajotti~~ ruukun*]]

The fronting of *hajjotti*, according to Holmberg (2016), signals the fact that the proposition expressed by the question contains a free variable, which can be expressed by [±Pol]. This variable is the disjunctive set of alternatives: 'Marja broke the pot ([+Pol])' or 'Marja didn't break the pot ([-Pol])'. This free variable is supplied by the response:

(29)   *Hajotti.*
         broke ([+Pol])
         'Yes./She did.'

What is the syntax of *hajotti*? As stated above, the response has the same syntactic structure as the question. The difference is that everything except for the relevant part has been elided:

(30)   [CP *hajotti* [~~IP *Marja hajotti ruukun*~~]]

---

[59] An alternative accounts states that *yes* and *no* are clause substitutes, involving no ellipsis and substituting for a whole clause (see Krifka 2013).

Both in the question and in the response, the focussed part has been moved to C-domain, that is, outside of the inflected phrase, or, in our terminology, from the sentence answer. Since the remaining contents of the proposition are recoverable from the question, they can be elided from the response.

In the case of the echo response, this is relatively straightforward and unproblematic.[60] How does the same principle—movement to C-domain and elision—operate in the case of positive response particles, like *yes*? In the echo response in such languages as Finnish of Welsh the verb of the question is repeated, or, in syntactic terms, the verb is taken from the inflected phrase and fronted, which constitutes the move. The characteristic of a positive response using a positive response particle is that a new lexeme is introduced, and the verb is left alone. The question is, then, what is moved in this case.

Consider the following exchange (adapted from Holmberg 2016: 53):

(31)   Does John like the book?—Yes.

Under the principle of movement to C-domain and elision, the resulting representation of the response would look like this:

(32)   [[Yes] ~~John likes the book~~]]

However, since the original proposition is not *John yes likes the book*, how do we justify talking about movement to C-domain? The matter becomes clearer if we consider the response in the light of the free variable [±Pol], mentioned above. It can be said that in the case of polar questions, the information sought is the value for the free variable. The positive response assigns a value to the variable, so that the resulting proposition is true: [+Pol] (Holmberg 20016: 16). In (28)–(29), this value was supplied by *hajotti*. In (31), it was supplied by *yes*. Since the question contains the free variable [±Pol], that is, either the value [+Pol] or the value [-Pol], it can be said that in the echo response, the positive value was fronted together with the verb. In the case of a positive response particle in (31), the verb is left in place. *Yes*, just like *hajotti*, does the job of selecting the positive variable, so it is only the variable [±Pol] which was fronted, and the rest was, expectedly, elided:

(33)   [[+Pol] ~~John likes the book~~]]

---

[60] In this study I do not consider the move of the echoed verb and the position of the verb in the response.

When the polarity alone is fronted, the empty slot can be filled by a positive response particle, such as *yes*, *oui*, *ja*, and others.

The takeaway from the syntactic account presented in this section is, first, the idea of the movement and, second, the empty position. One of the main concerns of this study is that positive response particles originate inside the proposition, or, in our terminology, inside the sentence answer. The moved/fronted substance becomes a lexeme over time and fills the slot [+Pol] in the syntactic account presented here. The idea is not new. Thesleff (1960: 9) expresses it by observing that the responses such as *ita* and *sic* seem to be secondary developments from the echo response (which he refers to as the 'anaphoric response'). Even though in modern languages this fact is somewhat obscured, it is my impression that it would be confirmed for most, if not all, particle-based languages.

The idea of movement to C-domain underscores the position in the utterance a heuristic for the synchronic description of the Latin positive response system. In the previous section the components of a positive response were introduced, [particle] [sentence], and [additional]. By a careful analysis it can be shown in which position of the response a positive response strategy—a potential positive response particle—is located. This has implications for the correct understanding of the pragmatic function of the positive response strategy studied, its stage of diachronic development, and, by extension, for its meaning in the relevant historical period.

3.6   Conclusion

Based on the available literature on the echo response in other languages, I have, in Section 3.2.1, established a set of basic properties of the echo response, which should facilitate describing the echo response in Latin. I found that, in the echo-based or mixed systems, the echo response tends to be (1) the default positive response strategy; it tends to be (2) the neutral, that is, non-emphatic, positive response strategy; in most cases, (3) one word is echoed (with the rest of the sentence elided) or two, rarely more; (4) when the whole proposition is questioned, the verb is echoed; when a specific part of the proposition is questioned, the focal element of the question is echoed.

In Section 3.2.2, I attempted to do the same for the positive response particles. I found that positive response particles across languages (1) typically provide no more than polarity; they

tend to be (2) (mostly) neutral; they are (3) formally fixed; they are (4) typically located at the periphery of the utterance; and (5) they can co-occur with other positive response particles.

In Section 3.2.3, I have synthesised and linked these basic properties to indicators in the corpus chosen for this study. The form of a positive response strategy, the antecedent which triggers the positive response, and, in the case of positive response strategies, the position in the utterance, emerge as the indicators which are most likely to reveal the basic properties.

In the following sections, I elaborated on the three heuristics. In Section 3.3, I discussed the forms of both the echo response and the positive response particles to arrive to a set of formal categories. In Section 3.4, I choose a set of antecedents and discussed its import. I section 3.5, I discussed, based on the literature, parts of a positive response as well as the syntactic movement to C-domain by Holmberg (2016); the component parts established as well as the movement should be applicable cross-linguistically and will facilitate discussing positions of positive response particles in utterances and their potential for co-occurrence with other positive response strategies.

4 The Echo Response

4.1 Introduction

Based on studies on the echo response in other languages (Jones 1999 for Welsh, Sorjonen 2001 for Finnish, Armstrong 2008 for Brazilian Portuguese) and a formal discussion on positive responses in Latin by Brown *et al.* 2009), I take the following as the definition of the echo response:

- Repetition of the main verb to provide a positive response if the whole proposition is questioned;
- Repetition of an element other than the main verb to provide a positive response if a specific part of the proposition—'focal element' (Brown *et al.* 2009: 515)—is questioned.

To illustrate both with examples:

(1)   *Ajoiks   Anna   Helsinkiin eilen?   — Ajoi.*
        'drove Q   Anna   to Helsinki   yesterday?   — Drove.'
        'Did Anna drive to Helsinki yesterday?—Yes.' (Sorjonen 2001: 35)

(2)   *Lysidamus: tuaen fide credo?*
        *Cleostrata: **meae**.*
        'Can I trust your word?—Yes.' (Plautus, *Casina* 1007)

The utterer of the polar question in (1) would like to know whether the proposition 'Anna drove to Helsinki' can be taken as true. The responder indicates that the whole proposition is true by echoing the main verb. In (2), Lysidamus is not wondering about the idea of trusting someone's word, but rather whether he can trust Cleostrata's word specifically. He marks the information he is interested in by attaching the question particle to the corresponding lexeme and possibly by stressing it.[61] Cleostrata echoes the part in question; echoing the verb would not provide the response sought.

In Potočnik (2023) it was concluded that due to its functional versatility, the echo response was the primary positive response strategy in Latin as represented by the sources. This chapter studies the echo response in some detail based on the methodology from Chapter 3. Its principal

---

[61] See Brown *et al.* (2009: 519) for a short discussion of *-ne* and of questioning intonation.

aim is to describe the use of the echo response in Plautus and Terence. Ideally, this effort would make it possible to isolate the rules of the echo response as linguistic resource encoded in a language or the 'linguistic potential' of the echo response (Halliday 1984: 5) which the members of the language community can draw on to achieve their communicative needs.

One such rule is, for instance, that an echo response in Finnish can consist of an auxiliary verb and a main verb; in Welsh, on the other hand, it can only consist of one verb (Holmberg 2016: 3). The question is, to what extent such rules can be formulated for Latin. The matter is complicated by two realities. The first one is that the echo response as the linguistic resource is based on the act of repetition which has an extremely wide range of functions which themselves elude comprehensive description. The second is that our main sources for studying the echo response, comedies of Plautus and Terence, are works of poetry, a literary artifact, which loves to draw on functions of repetition for aesthetic reasons. This is relevant for any attempt at description, as it is in many cases, even within utterances clearly providing a positive response, not clear whether a particular occurrence of the echo response is motivated by the echo response as a linguistic resource, as encoded in mental grammar, or by the aesthetic appeal of repetition.

Before proceeding to the analysis of the echo response in Plautus and Terence, Section 4.2.1 sets the stage by discussing several examples of the echo response across languages to illustrate its behaviour. Section 4.2.2 discusses the relationship between the echo response and the phenomenon of repetition.

4.2   Preliminaries

4.2.1   Echo response across languages

The relative neglect of the echo response observed by Jones (1999) and others is surprising, not least because the echo response is far from being a curiosity among languages of the world. Holmberg (2016: 3) observes that close to half of the world languages use the echo response as their primary positive response strategy. And more importantly, even in the European linguistic area, where particle-oriented systems predominate, the echo response is present to a considerable extent. Examples (3)–(6) (discussed also in Potočnik 2023: 76–77) demonstrate some aspects of use of the echo response in European languages.

(3)   English: *Was Maradona the best football player ever?—Yes./He was./?The best.* (invented)

(4)   Portuguese: *Você tem irmãos?—Tenho.*

           'Do you have brothers?—I have.' (from Armstrong 2008: 291)

(5)   Slovenian: *A ga vidiš?— Ja. / Vidim.   /?Ga.* (invented)

           'Do you see him?   — Yes. / see-1st person sg. /Him.'

(6)   English: *You're not serious, are you?—?Yes./I am./Yes, I am.* (invented)

In English, the echo response is regularly used with auxiliary and modal verbs, sometimes also with full verbs (e.g., the exchange *do you see it?—I see it* seems fairly plausible in some unmarked circumstances, but that cannot be said about all verbs). In (3), the particle *yes* and the echo response are equivalent. *The best* can be echoed in special pragmatic circumstances.

In (4), the responder echoes the verb *ter* 'to have' to provide an unmarked positive response. According to Armstrong (2008: 288 and *passim*), the echo response is the default choice in Portuguese and the division of labour between different positive response strategies depends on co-interactants' background knowledge.

Slavic languages seem to use the echo response to a greater extent than Germanic and Romance languages. Jones (1999: 31–2) provides several illustrative examples from Czech and Russian. In (5), which illustrates Slovenian usage, using *ja*/*da* particle is adequate, but echoing the main verb is better, especially in higher registers. It is my impression that the echo response encourages further conversation, whereas using a particle does not necessarily do so.

In Slovenian, an additional unmarked echo response is available: echoing the non-emphatic personal pronoun *ga* 'him'. It is important to emphasise that echoing this pronoun is an unmarked choice and does not provide any emphasis; in terms of the definition above, the second speaker does not treat *ga* as the focal element, but responds to the whole proposition ('do you *see* him' rather than 'do you see *him*'; italics represent stress). This is important for our study, as the analysis in sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 below will show that virtually all the examples of the pronominal echo in the corpus provide emphasis. A response in Slovenian, equivalent to the Latin pronominal echo would have to be provided by other means, such as by combining the particle and the verbal echo—*ja, vidim*—as well as a good measure of intonational cues. This example shows that the definition above is not straightforwardly applicable across languages and underlines the need for describing positive response systems in individual languages on their own terms.

The explanation for the neutral use of *ga* is that *ga* in this context seems to have undergone a degree of conventionalisation, so that in certain south-eastern dialects, the response *ga* has assumed some characteristics of a positive response particle, which means that the following exchange sounds perfectly natural to native speakers of the dialect:

(7) *A delaš?*   —   *Ga.*

Q   work.2nd sg.   —   him (particle?)

'Are you working? —   Yes.' (invented)

Unlike in (5), *ga* in (7) does not echo any element of the antecedent. *Ga* provides polarity to the same extent as the usual particles *ja/da*. The verb in the antecedent is furthermore intransitive and does not expect a direct object, which was the original function of *ga*. This means that *ga* is a non-echo, particle-like positive response. A plausible origin of this quasi-particle is an entrenchment via a bridging context (Heine 2002: 84–5) provided by environments encountered in (5): *ga*, a personal pronoun in accusative, frequently heard as a positive response to a polar question is reanalysed as a positive response particle. I refer to *ga* as 'particle-like', because unlike *ja/da*, it is not grammatical in all contexts.

Even though the unmarked usage in (5) is aided by the emancipation demonstrated by (7) and it is the echo of that particular word which is emancipated (echoing *ga*), rather than the pattern (echoing a pronoun), it does draw attention, first, to the fact that the echo response is a very versatile positive response strategy which would benefit from further cross-linguistic research, and, second, to the crucial aspect of the relationship between the echo response and the positive response particles; that is, it shows that positive response particles frequently (but not necessarily) start their path of development as echo responses (see Section 4.3.1.6 below for a context which does not fit into this theory).

Turning, finally, to example (6), as frequently discussed in linguistic typologies of positive responses (Sadock and Zwicky 1985: 189–91), differences between systems frequently emerge in the context of negatively biased questions, that is, when the utterer expects a negative response. Countering negative bias is semantically speaking 'saying no' and thus out of the remit of this study. However, (6) above is important because it shows that the echo response is sometimes the only felicitous option. In (6), the responder expects a negative response and, in this case, the particle, as frequently observed (e.g., Sadock and Zwicky: 1985: 190, Holmberg 2016: 5), would be at least ambiguous. To counter the negative bias, the echo response or the combination of the echo response and the particle is necessary.

The cross-linguistic examples introduced in this section show that not only is the echo response not a thing of the past (Latin and Greek) or of geographical periphery (Celtic languages of the British, Brittany, and Finland), but is present in many languages of the world as the primary strategy. Even where the echo response is not the primary strategy, it is often an option, a necessity in certain contexts, or socially preferable. In other words, the presence of the echo response in a language is a matter of degree, rather than a categorical state. As shown by (7), the echo response can spill over into the area of positive response particles. More research is needed into the echo responses in individual languages. This chapter attempts to bridge this gap for Latin.

4.2.2 Repetition versus Echo response

In Halliday's (1984: 11) conception, a conversation is an exchange of commodities: either information (corresponding to our information antecedents), or services (corresponding to our action antecedents). This utilitarian view might lead one to think that a conversation should be as brief as possible, with little conversational noise—in other words, straight and to the point. In practice, however, conversation abounds in noise. A large part of conversational material consists, for instance, of repetition—of co-interactants' 'recycling'[62] what was said before and repeating it, sometimes over and over again. In this section, I discuss the echo response in the context of general conversational recycling to see what the relationship between the echo response and otherwise motivated repetition is; how and to what extent the echo response interacts with these other kinds in the corpus; and to discuss the resulting methodological implications for the study of the echo response.

First of all, my assumption here is that the echo response—the language potential in Halliday's terms (1984: 5) or the communicative resource Latin speakers can avail themselves of to achieve their communicative ends—is *grammaticalized repetition*.[63] I believe it is fair to say that in some languages, such as Welsh, Irish, and Finnish, the echo response is a linguistic resource in the same way as the expression *be going to* is to express the near future tense in English. Just like *be going to* has one single function—expressing near futurity—the echo response has one single function—providing a positive response. In the same way as speakers

---

[62] Term borrowed from Norrick (1987: 247).

[63] Since, in grammaticalization studies, focus is often on such phenomena as *fixity of form*, *formal erosion*, *univerbation*, stating that an essentially unpredictable verb can be a result of grammaticalization, might seem controversial. However, I am making no such claim. By using this term, I am not entering the discussion about the language process of grammaticalization. I am using the term 'grammaticalized' in the sense of 'part of grammar.'

of English do not think of 'movement from A to B' upon hearing *be going to* in the right context, speakers of Welsh, Breton, or Finnish do not see the echo response as repetition when they see a part of the antecedent repeated in a response. In this sense, both resources, *be going to* and the echo response, are parts of grammar.

Now, if something is a part of grammar, one expects a certain fixity of form and constraints on its use—so that any formal alterations or breaching of constraints make the resource in question ungrammatical. The fact that in Finnish, one may echo more than the main verb, while in Welsh, only the highest verb (Holmberg 2016: 3) can be echoed, is one such constraint. If the echo response was the default Latin positive response strategy, there is no reason to think that in Latin, constraints of this sort did not exist. However, as will become clear throughout this chapter, due to the nature of the sources, it is exceedingly hard to formulate them.

The comparison with *be going to* is again illustrative. One of the main clues that *be going to* is a part of grammar is that—as opposed to the verb *go*—it can occur with inanimate subjects which cannot *go* anywhere, as in this example:

(8)   *That house is going to collapse.* (based on Bybee 2003: 602–23)

There is no question that this instance of *going to* is different from, say, the one in the following sentence: *I am going to the store*. While in this case, *going* is to be interpreted in the original sense, in (8), the subject is *house* which cannot *go* and, more importantly, collapsing does not involve travelling. Another proof that *be going to* is a part of grammar is that replacing *going* with *travelling* would render the expression ungrammatical: **That house is travelling to collapse*.[64]

However, when one considers grammaticality of repetition, the matter is not so simple, not least because in any conversation, repetition occurs in many more functions than *go* does (or any one word). Additionally, boundaries between functions of repetitions are fuzzy and any instance of repetition can have several 'potential or actual motivations for recycling preceding speech' (Norrick 1987: 247). The result is that any conversational interaction can abound with repetition and only some of it (in echo-based languages) is grammaticalized. Key here is Norrick's observation that two 'actual' motivations for repetition can exist at the same time (and, as will become clear below, they frequently do), thereby making the task of

---

[64] See Bybee (2003: 602–23), from which these examples are taken an adapted, and other Bybee's works for illustrations of grammaticalizing constructions.

describing constraints on one of them almost impossible. Take the example (9) (already discussed in Section 3.3.1 of Chapter 3):

(9)   *Alcumena: [...] estne haec patera qua donatu's illi?*

Amphitruo: summe Iuppiter, quid ego video? **haec** *ea* **est** *profecto* **patera**. *perii, Sosia.*

'Isn't this the bowl you were presented with there?—Great Jupiter, what do I see? That is indeed the bowl. I'm done for, Sosia.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 780–1)

Alcumena shows Amphitruo a golden bowl which he supposedly offered her as a present that morning. Amphitruo, who sees that it is indeed his bowl, but knows that he had not offered it to his wife, is very surprised. Amphitruo's response is undeniably an echo response, with *haec*, *est* and *patera* echoed. Additionally, the relative clause *qua donatu's illi* is substituted by *ea*. If the Latin echo response system was anything like the ones found in modern languages, echoing any one of these three should have been sufficient. This means that at least some of the echoed material is redundant, because it is recoverable from the question. Despite the redundancy, however, the utterance makes sense and neither Alcumena nor Sosia (who is also present in the conversation) registered it as unexpected, let alone ungrammatical. That is because, in Amphitruo's response, several functions of repetition operate at the same time, none of them any more unexpected than others.

Seeing the bowl in Alcumena's possession surprises Amphitruo and renders him speechless. In such situations, speakers often replay all or a part of the previous move in order to keep the conversational floor and stall long enough to be able to prepare their next move (Norrick 1987: 249, see also Weiner and Goodenough 1977). It is not hard to imagine Amphitruo slowly uttering the words, frowning, and pensively turning the bowl in his hands (if, instead of looking at the bowl, he looked back at Alcumena, that would be a sign of yielding the floor; Norrick 1987: 249).

In this case, echoing a part of the question is motivated by at least two factors: the wish to confirm that that is indeed the bowl, and to keep the floor. A third motivation is also likely: to express surprise, since Amphitruo ultimately wants to get back on Alcumena's good side and to show that he is not being dishonest. While some motivations for certain types of repetitions will be discussed below, the point I would like to emphasise with this example is methodological: even though this is clearly a well formed, grammatical, and pragmatically felicitous utterance (in the sense that it is not surprising to any of the co-interactants, since it is

naturally anchored in preceding moves), due to different motivations (layers of pragmatic meaning) one cannot conclusively form any meaningful formal constraints about the echo response in it.

While a case such as this one is not an unlikely occurrence in modern languages as well (see (10) below), finding out about grammatical constraints on the echo response would still be possible by consulting a different written source or by asking native speakers of that language. In the case of Latin, Roman comedy, heavily laden with pragmatic meaning, is the only source available. This is why, in this section, I find it necessary to discuss functions of repetition in conversation found in literature and at the same time discuss their manifestations in Roman comedy. This should make it possible to peel away the conversational uses of repetition and thus come a step closer to a description of the echo response as a grammatical resource.

In taxonomies of repetition, it is standard to distinguish repetitions of one's own utterances and repetitions of co-interactants' utterances. Norrick (1987) speaks about 'second-speaker repetition' and 'same-speaker repetition'. Even though same-speaker repetition is in cognitive and interactional terms at least as important as second-speaker repetition, I shall gloss over it[65] and focus on second-speaker repetition.

Norrick (1987: 249) mentions several parameters to further classify second-speaker repetitions. One of them is *orientation*: some instances are production-oriented, 'reflect[ing] the exigencies of face-to-face communication'; others are hearer-oriented and are intended as conscious strategies to make discourse 'more coherent and effective'. The next one is *immediacy*: some instances occur as immediate responses to first pair parts (such as responses to questions), other occur later in the discourse. The last parameter belongs to *conversation management* in that some repetitions yield the floor, others retain it for the speaker, such as in (9) above.

After the initial division of 'Outside adjacency pairs' and 'Inside adjacency pairs', Norrick (1987) recognises two types of repetition in the first and four types in the second category. Due to constraints of space, I discuss only the types relevant for our analysis: *closed*

---

[65] See Tannen (2007) for a recent treatment and many illustrative examples. See Norrick (1987: 254–63) for an exhaustive taxonomy and for the observation that much same-speaker repetition is modelled on second-speaker repetition, such as when a speaker asks and answers their own question for rhetorical purposes. Rhetorical questions also belong here, since a positive response to it is presupposed by the speaker (Norrick 1987: 261).

sets, *questions and answers*, and *statement—affirmation*. The paragraphs below summarise Norrick (1987: 248–51).

Closed sets. These include fixed formulas which tend to cluster at the beginnings and ends of conversations and typically include greetings. In English, echoing the first pair part seems to be standard and creativity tends to be marked (cf. *hi!—hi!* and *hi—yeah, hi…*). Our corpus in general reflects this situation. The echo response is frequent (*Trachalio, salve.—Salve, Ampelisca*[66]), but is not the only option. Implicit confirmation tends to occur as unmarked (*O mi popularis, salve.—Et tu edepol, quisquis es*[67]). Creativity is frequent (*valen? valuistin?— valeo et valui rectius*[68]).

Questions and answers. Included here are repetitions questioning the foregoing statement and those answering the foregoing question. The former are in this study referred to as repairs, which are often realised by echo questions.[69] Since they do not provide a positive response (they actually tend to gravitate towards the negative response due to negative belief) and thus do not interfere with identification of the positive echo response, I leave them out of consideration in this section. The latter—answering a foregoing question—corresponds to the function of the echo response. While in some contexts in English (cf. (6) above) the echo response is an unmarked positive response strategy, note in the following example the interplay of several functions.

(10)   *And you can be a full-time Student?—And I can be a full-time Student. Yes.*
         (from Norrick 1987: 250)

Speaker 1 utters a polar question, to which Speaker 2 responds with the perfect echo response, followed by a positive response particle. Norrick (1987: 250) observes that such repeats 'show close attention to what others are saying' and 'signal interest and deference'. One may add that the positive response particle *yes* after the full echo response underscores the markedness of the echo response in English. Speaker 2 utters the full echo response as a show of deference or emphasis, but they also predict that Speaker 1 might focus on the additional layer of meaning conveyed by the echo and not on the fact that it is response, which would potentially disrupt the flow of the conversation. To counter this, Speaker 2 adds the positive response particle,

---

[66] Plautus, *Rudens* 336.
[67] Plautus, *Poenulus* 1039.
[68] Plautus, *Trinummus* 50.
[69] See Section 3.4.1 in Chapter 3.

which, in the minds of speakers of English, tends to be expected and unmarked. Even though in at least one context—after a negatively biased question, as in (6)—the echo response is the only acceptable option to provide a positive response, (10) shows that in English, a non-minimal, that is, longer, echo response is probably going to be marked.

Turning to Latin, consider example (11), where Dordalus is getting quite annoyed with Toxilus' incredulity.

(11)   *Toxilus: ubi nunc tua liberta est?*
        Dordalus: apud te.
        Toxilus: ain, apud me est?
        *Dordalus: **aio, inquam, apud te est, inquam**.*
        'Where's your freedwoman now?—At your place.—Do you say so? She's at my place?—Yes, I'm telling you, she's at your place, I'm telling you.'
        (Plautus, *Persa* 490–1)

Toxilus cannot believe that the freedwoman in question is at his place, so he issues a repair. Dordalus provides a positive response by explicitly echoing all parts of the antecedent to make sure that his annoyance at Toxilus' incredulity does not go unnoticed. Let us compare this exchange with (10) above. In (10), Speaker 2 wanted to prevent the markedness of the echo to get out hand, so they feel compelled to add an unmarked positive response in order to keep the conversation going. I took this as evidence that the longer echo response is marked in English. Now, in (11), Dordalus first echoes the main verb. However, if, as indicated by many cases in our corpus, echoing the main verb passes for an unmarked response in Latin, it will not serve Dordalus' intention to make his feelings known. In order to make his response marked, then, he prolongs it to comical proportions by echoing first the main verb and then the rest of the response.

Now, as opposed to longer echo responses (see examples in Section 4.3.1.7 below), which echo redundant material, I would argue that in this case, one can speak of two echo responses. I base this conclusion on the use of *inquam*, which is frequently used after positive response strategies and often marks the end of an utterance, but even when it does not, it tends to mark the end of an echo response—that is, it constitutes a unit with the preceding echo, e.g., *aio inquam*[70], or *ita inquam*[71]. Just as (10) above can be divided into the echo response and *yes*, (11) can be

---

[70] Plautus, *Mostellaria* 965.
[71] Plautus, *Amphitruo* 362.

divided into *aio, inquam* and *apud te est, inquam*—both of which could stand alone. Dordalus could have meant to provide a usual response,[72] which would retain the flow of the conversation, but then, with his emotional state rising, he topped it up with another echo response (which, additionally, echoes non-standard material). In other words, while in (11), Speaker 2 wanted to tone down the emotional element by adding the unmarked response, in this case, Speaker 2 wants to tone up the emotional element by adding another, marked response. If this analysis is correct, it follows that echoing the main verb *aio* is unmarked.

The purpose of adducing (10) and (11) was to show that motivations for using repetition in a positive response are diverse and not always clearly identifiable (it is, for instance, not clear whether Dordalus is angry or just wants to point out that Toxilus' incredulity is unwarranted). While identifying constraints on the echo response might be too ambitious a goal, examples such as (10) and (11), which contain several positive response strategies, are methodologically significant (as long as it is possible to identify *some* pragmatic reason behind the additional strategy, which in (10) and (11) is the case). While statistical evidence in sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 suggests that the echo response is the default positive response strategy in Latin, but is not sufficient to conclusively prove it (since frequency alone in such sources as the Roman comedy cannot automatically imply unmarkedness), example (11) suggest that that might indeed be the case.

Statement affirmation. Continuing with Norrick's (1987) taxonomy of repetitions, his next category are repetitions which follow a co-interactant's statement (which corresponds to statement antecedent in our study). There can be several motivations for statement affirmation. Norrick recognises *acknowledgement*, *concurring*, *spotlighting*, and *accepting a formulation*. Due to constraints of space, it is not possible to illustrate all of them, so I shall only illustrate spotlighting, because it is a strategy frequently used by Plautus and Terence.

(12)   C: And this was in a stone castle, you see. Bloody cold.

           B: A stone castle, and excessively bloody cold. (from Norrick 1987: 250)

In (12), B echoes a significant part of the antecedent to signal agreement. The choice of material to be echoed depends on B's intention to spotlight a part of it, namely the fact that it was even colder than C admits. In English, this is overtly a marked example. In my corpus, such cases

---

[72] This, incidentally, would also mean that *inquam*, due to overuse in the theatre-speak, lost its markedness. Based on its frequency and compatibility with other intensifiers, this seems a likely conclusion.

are categorised as positive responses to statements. In (12), the form of the repetition depends on the element Speaker 2 wants to spotlight.

(13)   *Aeschinus: ehem, pater mi! tu hic eras?*

Demea: tuos hercle vero et animo et natura pater, qui te amat plus quam hosce oculos.

'Oh hello, my dear father! I didn't realise you were here.—Your father indeed in heart and in nature, who loves you more than his own eyes.' (Terence, *Adelphoe* 901–2)

In (13), Aeschinus' utterance is intended as a conversation starter or a greeting. Wishing to spotlight the fact that he is Aeschinus' father, Demea ignores Aeschinus' illocutionary intent (to start a conversation) and imagines a statement in its place (*you are my father*). In response, he echoes the relevant noun and significantly expands it.

On the surface, it is an exaggerated outpouring of fatherly love, topped off with a proverbial expression. It is fitted into the framework of the adjacency pair *polar question—echo response*. Even though this framework is somehow present in both co-interactant's minds, however, neither conforms to it completely. From Aeschinus' side, this was going to be a *polar question—echo response* adjacency pair, but since his utterance is a conversation starter, it is unlikely he expected a response. In Demea's reimagined form, this is an echo response of the type *statement—echo response*, even though the antecedent is a more or less rhetorical question. In sum, the glue that hold the adjacency pair together is the echo response framework, although both parts are significantly reworked. This example shows that the echo response pattern was clearly present in Latin speakers' minds. However, due to the high frequency of creative reworkings of the pattern, our ability to describe it is limited.

I would like to conclude this section by an aesthetic motivation, which abounds especially in Plautus. Consider the following example.

(14)   *Periphanes: **haec inquam est**.*

*Miles: **non haec inquam est**. non novisse me meam rere amicam posse?*

*Periphanes: hanc, **inquam**, filius meus deperibat fidicinam.*

*Miles: **haec non est ea**.*

*Periphanes: quid? **non est**?*

*Miles: **non est**.*

'I'm telling you, this is her.—And I'm telling you, this is not her. Do you think I don't know my own girlfriend?—I'm telling you, my son was madly in love with this lyre girl.—This isn't her.—What? It isn't her?—It isn't her.' (Plautus, *Epidicus* 480–3)

In (14), there is a chain of repetitions starting with *haec inquam est*, which continues to different degrees through all six moves. The second move suggests that the repetition is comically deliberate, since *non haec inquam est* has an unusual, almost ambiguous word order (in a usual formulation, *non* and *est* should be closer together). Examples such as this are significant for at least two reasons. First of all, Platus' predilection for repetition can rarely be excluded as a motivating factor for the use of echo response, thus making relative frequencies less reliable. Secondly, this chain of repetitions makes it harder to judge whether the form of the echo response in the last move, *non est*, is marked or unmarked, since echoing both words has a stronger aesthetic effect than echoing a bare *non* (see also (29) below, where *-ne* is echoed in the response).

The illustrations in this section, framed according to Norrick's (1987) taxonomy, were meant to illustrate that providing a positive response is only one of several possible motivations for repeats in responses.[73] The second aim of this section was to show how conversational exigencies and mutual consideration of co-interactants in many cases make it difficult to judge the echo response as a grammatical category—not only because they influence the form of the response in a way that is not always clear, but because in many cases the intention of providing a positive response is often inseparable from other intentions—that is, it is hard to say whether any of the motivations present is more dominant than others. The takeaway from this section is that there are two kinds of repetition. First, there is the *act of repetition*, which recycles material from antecedents for various extra-grammatical reasons. Secondly, if Latin was an echo-based language according to Sadock and Zwicky's (1985) taxonomy, there also existed *the grammatical resource of the echo response*, which was based on repetition, but fundamentally different from other repetitions. While I will not attempt to formulate grammatical constraints on the echo response, the analysis that follows should make it possible to distinguish between instances of the echo response and otherwise motivated repetitions.

---

[73] See also Tannen's excellent overview of functions of repetition in conversation (Tannen 2007: 61–84 and *passim*).

4.3 Analysis of the echo response in Plautus and Terence

In Chapter 3, the basic properties of the echo response as a linguistic resource to provide a positive response were established. Each of them was linked to a heuristic which should help to find out to what extent the properties hold for the echo response in Latin. Studying forms should reveal whether one word was usually echoed, as in modern languages, and whether the focal element determines the form. Studying antecedents should reveal whether the echo response was a neutral positive response strategy; together with the form, they should reveal whether the focal element in the antecedent—what the point of the exchange is—determines the form of the echo response. The ultimate goal is to compare the echo response in Latin to the echo response in other languages and to establish pragmatic trends which govern its use.

4.3.1 Forms

This section studies the formal properties of the echo response based on the categories established in Section 3.3.1 of Chapter 3. Proceeding from the overview of forms in both authors, I analyse examples of each and, in addition to the goal stated above, I attempt to identify pragmatic reasons why a particular form of the echo response is chosen in a given context.

Table 4.3.1a below shows the frequencies of formal categories in the corpus. In Terence's column, the attested values are accompanied by the same values multiplied by 3.2 in square brackets for ease of comparison with the values from Plautus, since Plautus' corpus is approximately 3.2-times larger than that of Terence. All the tables in this study follow this system.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Verb in active indicative	270	55 [176]
Verb in passive indicative	10	1 [3.2]
Verb in non-indicative	34	6 [19.2]
Pronoun	37	12 [38.4]
Pronoun + verb	16	2 [6.4]

Particle	6	8 [25.6]
Particle + verb	5	
Long repetition	10	1 [3.2]
Other	43	17 [54.4]

Table 4.3.1a

4.3.1.1 Verb in active indicative

The high values in this category (which will regularly be referred to as the 'verbal echo' throughout this study) in both authors seem to be consistent with the cross-linguistic findings on the importance of the verbal echo. I suggest in addition, that they are high enough to expand the conclusion to Latin usage outside Roman comedy. This is supported by the fact that verbal echo, as we will see in Section 4.3.2, is found in response not only to both main groups of antecedents—information and action—but to all antecedents identified in the corpus. The second piece of supporting evidence is that in most cases of verbal echo, no pragmatic factor can be identified which would suggest that it represents marked usage. The following example illustrates the typical use of the echo response in the corpus.

> (15)   *Leonida: eho, ecquis pro vectura olivi rem solvit?*
>
>   *Libanus:* **solvit***.*
>
>   'Hey, did anyone pay for shipping the oil?—Yes.' (Plautus, *Asinaria* 433)

The exchange is from a scene where Leonida pretends to be Libanus' superior and asks him whether various household affairs have been taken care of, one of which is payment for shipping the oil. The antecedent is a polar question by Leonida, and the proposition in question is *someone paid for shipping the oil*. It is most likely stressed somewhere on *rem soluit*. Libanus' provides the positive response sought by echoing the verb, which is sufficient to address the whole proposition. According to our definition of the echo response, echoing anything else would not address the whole proposition. Echoing, for instance, *pro vectura olivi* would have Leonida understand that the shipping of the oil was paid for, but something else was not, something like: 'As far as shipping the oil goes, yes, but…'

Note, in the following example, how tense is used to provide a non-categorical positive response.

(16)   *Phaniscus: non hic Philolaches adulescens habitat hisce in aedibus?*

                Theopropides: **habitavit***, verum emigravit iam diu ex hisce aedibus.*

                'Doesn't young Philolaches live here in this house?—He did, but he moved house long ago.' (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 950–1)

The antecedent is a positively biased polar question. Theopropides provides the positive response by echoing the verb *habitat* and modifying its tense. The echo gives Phaniscus the signal that his idea was somewhat correct. The modification of the tense (present > perfect) narrows the response down. While it is argued in this study that non-echo responses are semantically equivalent to the echo response (they both provide nothing more nor less than polarity), this example shows one useful feature which non-echo responses do not have: a handy device for a partial positive response. In general, saying no to things is dispreferred—by saying no, the speaker risks coming of as rude or brusque. By 'somewhat confirming', Theopropides softens the response, reduces the face-threatening act, and secures the goodwill of the co-interactant.

4.3.1.2   Verb in passive indicative

While the difference in verbal echoes in active indicative (above) in both authors is negligible, that is not the case here: Plautus has 10 verbs echoed in passive indicative and Terence only one—when adapted for the difference in size of both corpora, it emerges that Plautus has approximately three times more cases than Terence. No verbal echoes in passive indicative are found after information antecedents in either author. This is not a given and looking into it in detail may reveal additional information on the nature of the *question—response* and *statement—response* exchanges in Roman comedy. Since this is a broader study, I have to gloss over that.

For whatever reason, then, all occurrences in this category are limited to action antecedents. Note also that these are not echoed passives, but rather passive echoes of active verbs in antecedent, that is, Speaker 2 decides to use passive voice instead of active. Both observations—clustering around action antecedents and Speaker 2's choice—suggest that the reasons for this choice are pragmatic. Take the following example.

(17)   *Olympio: tam mi mea vita tua quam tibi cara est. verum i modo.*

                Lysidamus: si tu iubes, em **ibitur** *tecum.*

'My life is as dear to me as yours is to you. All the same, come along.—If you tell me, well, I'll go with you.' (Plautus, *Casina* 758)

The example is from a quasi-saturnalian scene,[74] where the old man Lysidamus plays a submissive lover of his slave Olympio. The antecedent is a directive requiring immediate carrying out and is in contrast with the amorous effusion which precedes it. Such a directive is usually responded to by a verb in active indicative, if Speaker 2 is submissive (see Section 6.2 of Chapter 6). Not here: Lysidamus is a higher character and verbalises the peculiarity of his receiving an order first with *si tu iubes* (showing that it is not obvious for him to take an order[75]) and then with the echo response in future passive, which allows him to show detachment from the situation. The reasons for Lysidamus' conversion *i > ibitur* are therefore situational or pragmatic: they are related to social dynamics from the point of view of the interactants or dramaturgic technique (saturnalian scene) from the point of view of the author.

In fact, 8 out of 10 passive indicative echoes in Plautus are in future tense and while the pragmatic reasons are not always as easily traceable as in (17), the explanation of detachment is compatible with all occurrences. The one occurrence of passive echo in Terence, however, is different.

(18)   *Pamphilus: vide, mi Parmeno, etiam sodes ut mi haec certa et clara attuleris.*
          ne me in breve conicias tempus gaudio hoc falso frui.
          Parmeno: **visumst***.*
          Pamphilus: certen?
          Parmeno: certe.
          Pamphilus: deus sum si hoc itast.
          Parmeno: verum reperies.
          'My dear Parmeno, make sure once more, if you will, that what you're telling me is clear and definite, and that you're not condemning me to momentary enjoyment of a spurious happiness.—I have made sure.—Absolutely?—

---

[74] For saturnalian scenes see Segal (1987).

[75] It is not obvious for him insofar as he is a higher character. Lysidamus as a representative of his character type, on the other hand, is anything but typical and gets humiliated throughout the play, by his wife or in scenes such as this one. The success of this reversal of roles, however, critically depends on audience's assumption that, on the social ladder, he is higher than Olympio. The overt linguistic strategies used in this example by both characters make the reversal more salient and easier to follow.

Absolutely.—I'm a god, if this is right.—You'll find it's true.' (Terence, *Hecyra* 841–3)

In (18), Pamphilus is trying to make sure that Parmeno is entirely sure that he is giving him accurate information. The antecedent is a polar question, uttered in the form of a directive. Parmeno echoes *vide* by converting it into perfect passive. As opposed to (17), in this case the pragmatic reason of detachment is present only to a small extent, if at all. First of all, the change of tense makes this positive response less categorical—it actually implies that no admonition is necessary. Secondly, *visum est* seems to be formulaic, as suggested by the presence of a very similar exchange in Plautus.[76] It contains the identical pattern *vide > visum est* (without contraction of *esse*) and is, just like the present one, followed by a repair. Thirdly, our example is followed by an additional repair, which approaches this exchange to another recurring pattern—a series of repairs in which every repair is deliberately responded to by a different positive response strategy.[77] Such a series of positive responses is such a frequent occurrence that it must be taken into account when considering reasons for choosing one positive response strategy over another. Ultimately, it seems that while Plautus uses the passive echo response for pragmatic reasons, Terence does not, and the one example which does occur is likely there only because it is a part of a recurring structure.

This difference in the use of the passive echo responses between the two authors complements what is known about the difference between Plautus' and Terence's comedies in general. Plautus makes heavy use of situational comedy which can easily be traced through pragmatic analysis, such as the reversal of conversational expectations, where Speaker 2 responds not to Speaker 1's illocution, but to some other assumption which happens to be present in the utterance—not unlike modern sitcoms, which frequently draw on the same sort of pragmatic resources. Terence's comedy, on the other hand, relies less on situational comedy and more on the psychological reality of the characters, which is also reflected in the restrained dialogue. The restraint is, of course, not limited to the use of the passive echo response. As we will see throughout this analysis, Terence's column in the table tends to have several empty cells—his use of positive response strategies is less varied than Plautus' because it is less important for his comedy. The difference in Terence's language was reflected during categorisation as well,

---

[76] Plautus, *Mercator* 324.
[77] Plautus, *Pseudolus* 360–6.

because he, as the precursor of Classical Latin, uses responses more elaborate than a simple *yes* or *no*.

4.3.1.3 Verb in non-indicative

In this category, the verbs of the antecedent are echoed in imperative or subjunctive. They are usually not triggered by information antecedents (see Section 4.3.2). They are also triggered by action antecedents other than a directive. This is expected: the felicitous response to a directive is an actual confirmation in indicative, not a potential one in subjunctive; as for the information antecedents, the informational gap which information antecedents seek to fill can in principle only be filled by a response in indicative and is equally incompatible with non-indicative responses. In all other combinations, one may rightfully seek a pragmatic explanation (see (25) and (26) below).

In Plautus, such echoes are realised 26 times by imperatives and 8 times by subjunctives. In Terence, it is the other way around, with 4 cases in subjunctive and two in imperative. The difference is again not limited to numbers and reflects the qualitative difference between Plautine and Terentian comedy. The following is a representative example from Plautus:

(19)   *Amphitruo: [...] Alcumena, unum rogare te volo.*
          Alcumena: quidvis [rogare] **roga***.*
          'Alcumena, I want to ask you one thing.—Ask anything you like.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 708)

This is another exchange from Amphitruo and Alcumena's fight which happens after Jupiter, looking like Amphitruo, had visited Alcumena the same morning, and now the two (real) spouses mutually accuse each other of lying. After being warned by the slave Sosia not to anger Alcumena even more, Amphitruo issues the plea in (19). The antecedent is a preparatory move, by which Amphitruo carefully broaches the ensuing difficult conversation. Alcumena agrees by echoing *rogare* in imperative. This is one of the typical antecedents for which an imperative echo response is used, because the commitment to carry out the action is on Speaker 1, so Speaker 2 has to send it back to them by using the imperative echo, itself a directive.

Even though echo responses in non-indicative are, in principle, not expected after directives, they do occur. In fact, this is another pragmatic resource which Plautus frequently draws upon to construct conversations full of unexpected turns and aggressive quid-pro-quos on the part of

the slave. In the following example Speaker 2 rudely turns Speaker 1's suggestion or order back at him:

(20)   *Thesprio: abi in malam rem maxumam a me cum istac condicione.*
         *Epidicus: **i** sane [...].*
         'Go away from me and be hanged on those terms.—No, you go […].' (Plautus, *Epidicus* 78–9)

In Terence, imperative echoes occur only twice, in both cases in unmarked situations, with Speaker 1 asking Speaker 2 how to proceed.[78]

As for the subjunctive echoes, they occur rarely in Plautus and all occurrences are curiously limited to four comedies—all of which are, according to Sedgwick's (1949: 382) chronology, from the late period: *Mostellaria* (188 BCE), *Poenulus* (191 BCE), *Rudens* (189 BCE), and *Truculentus* (190 BCE).[79] In Terence, they occur 4 times, which is the majority of non-indicative echo responses (4 out of 6 occurrences). They are used in different contexts and for different reasons than in Plautus. This difference to some extent maps onto the fact that in three cases (that is, all but one), Terentian occurrences are in the 1st person plural, occurring in contexts of harmony or group activity, as in (21):

(21)   *ibi continuo Antipho "voltisne eamus visere?" alius "censeo. **eamus**, duc nos sodes."*
         'Immediately Antipho said: "Shall we go and look?" Someone else said:
         "Good idea. Let's go. Lead the way, if you will."' (Terence, *Phormio* 102–3)

In Plautus, on the other hand, only two occurrences out of 8 are in the 1st person plural, all others occurring in contexts of individual activity, sometimes with dismissive overtones or even in reversed directives (cf. (20) above):

(22)   *Agorastocles: quid si adeamus?*
         *Milphio: **adeas**.*
         'What if we approach them?—Do.' (Plautus, *Poenulus* 330)

(23)   *Labrax: quin tu hinc is a me in maxumam malam crucem?*
         *Charmides: **eas**. easque res agebam commodum.*

---

[78] *Hecyra* 442–3; *Hecyra* 787.
[79] E.g., *Mostellaria* 772; *Poenulus* 330; *Poenulus* 606–7; *Rudens* 834.

> 'Why don't you leave me alone and go and hang yourself?—You go. I was about to suggest the very same.' (Plautus, *Rudens* 518–9)

Even though verbs in non-indicative moods are not expected after information antecedents, there are two occurrences present in Plautus. As suspected above, they occur in marked contexts:

(24)   *Charmides: prehende. iam tenes?*
         Eutychus: teneo.
         Charmides: **tene**.
         'Take it. Are you holding it now?—Yes.—Do.' (Plautus, *Mercator* 883)

In (24), Charmides asks Eutychus to give him his arm and verbalises the act by checking with him whether he is holding it. He receives a positive response (verbal echo), which is, in this case, our antecedent. He echoes the response and provides the third move, sometimes referred to as 'evaluative move' (Risselada 1993: 56). This example, incidentally, shows why a description of these exchanges in isolation can never be complete. Even though I categorised this example as a statement antecedent, it is not a typical statement antecedent. The reason why the *tene* response is possible is the fact that it provides a positive evaluation of the action and is in this sense closer to an agreement to an action than to a confirmation of a piece of information—the difference being that in most other cases, the action referred to is supposed to occur in the future, whereas in this case it is already occurring. In terms of categorization, then, this antecedent demonstrates that boundaries between categories of antecedents to positive responses are fuzzy and subject more to arbitrary decisions of the analyst than to circumstances of the communicative realities represented by them.

For a pragmatic analysis, the next example is more interesting as it overtly expresses the misunderstanding which occurs when Speaker 2 fails to address the illocutionary intent of Speaker 1.

(25)   *Tranio: [...] dic te daturum, ut abeat.*
         Theopropides: egon dicam dare?
         Tranio: **dice**.
         Theopropides: egone?
         Tranio: **tu ipsus**. *dic modo, ausculta mihi. promitte, age inquam: ego iubeo.*
         'Say that you're going to give it to him to make him go away.—I should say

that I'm giving it?—Do say so.—I?—Yes, you. Just say it, listen to me. Promise, go on, I'm telling you; I'm commanding you.' (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 633–5)

The slave Tranio and the old man Theopropides are trying to get rid of a moneylender who is refusing to leave without the money he is owed. The antecedent is a directive by Tranio to Theopropides to promise him the money. Theopropides does not understand why he should be the one to promise him the money, which he expresses with a repair. Now, these repairs, as we shall see in the following section, are usually followed by a pronominal echo response, so the response expected by both Theopropides and the audience would be *tu*. Instead, Tranio echoes the verb of the antecedent *dice*. Theopropides still does not understand and needs to repeat his repair. It is hard to say, of course, whether Theopropides is just so shocked that he needs to verify twice or his pragmatic awareness is so exquisite (or, indeed, so bad!) that he actually does not understand the unexpected response. But consider Tranio's move, after he gives the expected response. He rushes Theopropides into doing what he is told by adding a series of imperatives, which are more appropriate for a master urging his slave than *vice versa*. The result is a sort of (short and one-sided?) saturnalian scene. It is possible, then, that the real reason for the unexpected *dice* is to signal this reversal of roles: Plautus might have deliberately chosen it, for the same reason as the series of imperatives. Taken together in this way, this interpretation lends support to the idea that *dice* is perceived as an unusual response by Theopropides (and the audience) and that Plautus the author was aware of it.

4.3.1.4   Pronoun

The marked example above offers a natural transition into what I shall refer to as the pronominal echo. In general, all types of pronouns are echoed, mostly personal, possessive, and demonstrative, and in various cases.[80] If it was possible, with reasonable certainty, to extend the conclusions on the verbal echo to the Latin language outside the world of Roman comedy, this will be harder in the case of the pronominal echo. As observed by Müller (1997: 192) in discussing Terence, this strategy (referred to by him as '*Pronominale Wiederaufnahme*') is used in Roman comedy to bring tension into the dialogue and carries an antagonistic element. This is reflected in my corpus as well. As we will see in the discussion of repairs in Section 4.3.2, the majority of pronominal echo responses follow the repair

---

[80] The reader should be advised that I only consider echoed occurrences; pro-form responses—cases where a pronoun is used to refer to a proper name or some other element in the antecedent, are not considered here.

antecedent (which either requires an emphasis or an emphasis is appropriate for it); when it does not, a mismatch between the expectations or the background knowledge (Müller 1997: 192) of the two speakers can still be identified, as in the following example.

(26)   *Sosia: non loquar nisi pace facta, quando pugnis plus vales.*
         Mercurius: dic si quid vis, non nocebo.
         Sosia: tuae fide credo?
         *Mercurius: **meae**.*
         'I won't speak unless peace has been made, since you have more strength in your fists.—Say what you want, I won't harm you.—Can I trust your promise?—Yes.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 390–1)

After the verbal and physical fight between Mercury and Sosia in front of Amphitruo's estate, Sosia asks for peace. Upon Mercury's assurance that he will not be harmed, Sosia follows up with a post-expansion, as the conditions for the resolution of the exchange have not been met, since his experience with Mercury was not such that he could accept his word without additional assurance. The post-expansion is realised by a negatively biased, not a neutral question, so *tuae* probably receives the stress. *Tuae* is the part of the proposition which triggers the pronominal echo, not the question as a whole. *Meae*, in turn, carries the emphasis to counter Sosia's (justified) doubt.

It is worth asking to what extent the pronominal echo response found in the corpus is a part of the artistic language or the theatre-speak of Roman comedy, and what part of it reflects the Latin usage in general. For the nature of the comic conversation—caricatured, exaggerated exchanges—should, in my view, not be the reason to dismiss a language phenomenon as limited to those sources and thus non-naturalistic: as was said above, the fact is it was used as a comic strategy ('*Mittel, Spannung in den Dialog zu bringen*'; Müller 1997: 192) means that, in some form or other, it existed *before* the comedy, even if it assumed a special character when the comedy got hold of it. The example (26), for one, seems to be naturalistic enough and to correspond to the second part of the definition of the echo response, given at the beginning of this chapter: if a specific element of the proposition is in question, that element is echoed.

Even though intensifying strategies are not studied systematically here, in pronominal echoes they are present to such an extent that they can hardly be glossed over. Plautus uses them much more frequently than Terence, which suggests that they are a matter of author's choice. In other words, even though the audience was used to hearing personal pronouns followed by *ipsus*,

they would not be confused if the intensifiers were not present. Compare the exuberant intensification by Plautus in (27) and, on the other hand, the restrained use in Terence in (28).

(27)   *Pseudolus: liberam hodie tuam amicam amplexabere.*

Calidorus: egone?

*Pseudolus: **tu istic ipsus, inquam**, si quidem hoc vivet caput.*

'You'll embrace your girlfriend as a free woman today.—I?—You there yourself, I tell you, if this head of mine lives.' (Plautus, *Pseudolus* 722–3)

Calidorus, a depressed youth hopelessly in love, is sceptical about his chances of ever embracing the object of his affection, so when Pseudolus suggests that he might be able to do so that very day, he expresses his doubt with a repair. While the pronominal echo is emphatic in itself (as evidenced by the fact that it is the main echo strategy for responding to repairs), its frequent occurrence with various intensifying strategies might suggest that it is not emphatic enough, so intensifying strategies have to be added. Pseudolus, however, piles up three of them, each of them clearly attested as an intensifying positive response strategy in its own right. Since it is unlikely that Calidorus' doubt is such that one single intensifier—*tu istic*, *tu ipsus*, or *tu, inquam*— would not be able to counter it, it seems to me that the intensifying strategies might have surpassed their original function: that sometimes they are indeed necessary, but mostly they are a part of the artistic language or theatre-speak (the same will be suggested for the high frequency of *sequor* and *abeo* and the like in Section 4.3.2).

The audience, in other words, will have noticed Pseudolus' pile-up of intensification strategies. Indeed, Roman comedy is full of such meta-theatrical humour.[81]

Compare (28) to the following one from Terence.

(28)   *Simo: quin dic, quid est?*

Davus: ait nimium parce facere sumptum.

Simo: mene?

*Davus: **te** […].*

'Why don't you tell me? What is it?—He says you're being too tight-fisted.— Me?—You.' (Terence, *Andria* 449–50)

---

[81] For meta-theatre see Christenson (2019).

The slave Davus is forced to have an awkward conversation with his master Simo about the fact that Simo's son thinks he is being stingy in financing his wedding. The surprised Simo issues a repair (partly because the subject accusative *te* is omitted in Davus' move), to which Davus awkwardly echoes the non-intensified pronoun. Davus probably chooses to avoid intensification because of his hesitant manner—*te ipsum* or something even stronger might be considered too forward for such a sensitive subject. This sensitivity again shows the qualitative difference between the two playwrights' languages, as does the fact that the pronoun is echoed in accusative in order to carry over the subject accusative construction, which does not happen in Plautus—a Plautine old man would probably have repaired with *egone* in nominative and the Plautine slave would have no problem retorting in nominative with *tu ipsus, inquam*, or the like. Intensification of the pronominal echoes in Terence does, of course, occur, but Müller (1997: 193) also observes that in Terence's use of such responses one may speak of idiomatisation, which implies that the intensified pronominal echo occurs by virtue of (theatrical?) convention rather than the need to intensify. Thus, since the plausible reason of intensifying by convention exists, we have no reason to take it as a sign of a lack of emphasis in the pronominal echo response.

While I shall say no more on intensification in connection to the pronominal echo response, one particular type of emphasis deserves a special mention; it is demonstrated by (29).

> (29)   *Ergasilus: quin ita faciam, ut <tu>te cupias facere sumptum, etsi ego votem.*
> *Hegio: egone?*
> *Ergasilus:* **tune***.*
> 'No, I'll take care that you yourself wish to squander money, even if I forbade it.—I?—Yes, you.' (Plautus, *Captivi* 856–7)

Upon Ergasilus' prediction, Hegio reacts with a repair, expressing surprise. Ergasilus provides a positive response by not only echoing the pronoun, but ostensibly also the question particle. There has been some debate on how best to understand this highly unusual use of *-ne* in positive responses in the small set where it occurs.[82] On the one hand, it is possible to see here the 'asseverative' particle *nē* (see, for instance, Warren 1881[83]). On the other, it may be a mocking

---

[82] Plautus, *Curculio* 139; *Epidicus* 73 and 541; *Miles gloriosus* 309 and 565 and 936; Terence, *Adelphoe* 770; *Andria* 478; *Heauton timorumenos* 950.

[83] While Warren (1881: 70, cited in Anderson 1914: 186) has shown that there is no way that *-e* in *tune* scans long (as required by *nē*-interpretation), he also pointed out that the 'rapidity of movement' and 'the mocking effect' would be lost, if it did.

echo of the interrogative particle, in line with Plautus' propensity for alliteration and repetition (Anderson 1914: 186; see Section 4.2.2 above), which is the position I am inclined to take.

Apart from the conclusion that the linguistic resource of the pronominal echo must have existed in the Latin of the time, one can say little more. In both Plautus and Terence, the theatrical uses of intensifiers are obvious, albeit for different reasons: in Plautus, they were used to such a degree that their usage passed into meta-humour, as in (27), where the audience must have appreciated the unnaturalistic piling up of the intensifiers which they were so used to hearing. If in (29) one may actually speak of echoing the question particle, this example supports that conclusion. When Terence uses intensifiers, he uses them in a more restrained manner and several of those occurrences can be accounted for in terms of idiomatization (see Müller 1997: 193 for examples).

4.3.1.5   Pronoun + verb

My intention here was to see whether a special pragmatic reason exists for echoing both the pronoun and the verb, as opposed to the pronoun only, but the evidence does not support any meaningful conclusion—which, of course, does not mean that there really are not any pragmatic reasons; on the other hand, there always exists the possibility that some uses are random or depend on factors which are not at the fore in this study, such as metrical considerations.[84]

4.3.1.6   Particle and Particle + verb

These two categories include cases where a particle is echoed, without and with a verb, respectively. The only particles which are echoed in my corpus are *ita*, *sic*, *non*, and *etiam*. The main motivation for showing values for these as separate categories was that all of these particles develop into positive response strategies in their own right. It is worth asking what role, if any, the particle echo response played in the diachronic development of positive response particles studied in Chapter 5.

First of all, since it was stated in several places that positive response particles evolved from the echo response, one might be tempted to think of it as a necessary stage, that is, that occurrences such as (30) below are the context based on which particles then became

---

[84] See Fortson's (2008) useful discussion on meter in Plautus.

conventionalised. According to this scenario, antecedents containing, for instance, *ita*, would provide a context for a sufficient currency of *ita* in responses. Subsequently, *ita* would become entrenched—it would gain sufficient traction among the language community to be reanalysed as a positive response in itself, rather than positive response by virtue of being echoed.

However, there are several problems with this. First of all, the data from our corpus do not support such a conclusion. Consider the following example.

(30)   *Cappadox: ego te vehementer perire cupio, ne tu [me] nescias.*
         Therapontigonus: itane vero?
         *Cappadox**: ita hercle vero.***
         'Just so you know, I very much wish that you come to a sticky end.—
         Indeed?—Yes indeed.' (Plautus, *Curculio* 724–5)

In this example from Plautus' *Curculio*, the soldier Therapontigonus is fighting with the pimp Cappadox, who owns Planesium, the soldier's love interest. In the first move, Cappadox is letting the soldier know that he wishes him dead. Therapontigonus retorts with the sarcastic repair *itane vero?*, to which Cappadox echoes both *ita* and *vero*, adding *hercle*. This is obviously a very comical example which exemplifies the problem of investigating the echo response in Roman comedy, namely the distinction between the echo response as a language resource and the echo response motivated by aesthetic reasons. In this case, one encounters aesthetic motivations on at least two levels:

-   *Itane vero* is a sarcastic response, probably accompanied with a substantial grimace; *ita hercle vero*, in turn, is also uttered sarcastically, probably in a prolonged, mocking manner;
-   The strong alliteration, for which Plautus displays a certain propensity, is an effect in itself.

More importantly for the discussion at hand, this example shows the type of antecedent which trigger the particle echo response. In both authors, in all cases but one, it is triggered by either a repair or some other post-expansion question—which means that they mostly occur in the third position in a conversation. In Plautus especially, as shown by (30), this is a good place to look for aesthetically motivated repetition, which makes it difficult to make conclusions about the Latin of the street. In this way, even if the theory above would somehow hold, it would not be sufficiently possible to study it in my corpus.

When one pursues this theory further and considers the types of antecedents which would be necessary for the theory of the particle echo response as a pre-stage to positive response particles to hold, one is probably justified in doubting whether there is even a theoretical possibility for this. For upon hearing the antecedent, Speaker 2 is much more likely to echo the verb in neutral contexts, not a particle. The only reason they would echo a particle is if specifically encouraged to do so by some special circumstances, such as a desire for emphasis or the lack of a verb. In other words, it seems simply unlikely that such contexts would occur with sufficient frequency to provide impetus for a particle to become independent.

If the theory is rejected, then the only possible explanation for the particle echo response seems to be that the independent particles, as well as the echoed particles are the result of the fact that a particular particle has achieved conventionalized status beforehand. The particle echo is then simply the result of two circumstances: that there exists such a thing as positive response particle, and that, by echoing that particle, a playwright can achieve an aesthetically pleasing effect—without any other pragmatic motivation. One may conclude then that the phenomenon of the particle echo does not lead to the independence of a positive response particle. In fact, both the antecedent and the response often use the same pre-made particle, such as in cases where a particle is resumed in a repair:

(31)   *Menedemus: non.*
         Chremes: quid? non?
         *Menedemus: **non**, inquam.*
         'No.—What? No?—No, I said.' (Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 893–4)

In this case, it is clear that for the existence of the antecedent, it was necessary for *non* to already exist as the response particle.

In terms of differences in usage between Plautus and Terence, I observe that in Plautus an echoed particle is frequently accompanied by something—either an intensifying strategy or a verb. For Terence, intensifying strategies are not at all important, which can be again traced to the 'psychological realism' of his comedies (Maltby 1979: 146), where excessive, caricatured expressivity has little place. Even in cases of sarcastic antecedents, the sarcastic response is more restrained, as in (32).

(32)   *Antipho: ah! dictum sapienti sat est.*
         Geta: itane?

> *Antipho:* **ita.**
>
> 'Oh! What I said should be enough for a clever person.—Is that so?—That is so.' (Terence, *Phormio* 541; my translation)

In this example, Geta's repair is obviously a question uttered in a sarcastic (or perhaps disappointed) tone. Where in Plautus, one would almost certainly expect something like *ita hercle vero* or *ita, inquam*, Antipho is satisfied with the minimal *ita*, which gives the exchange a different, more resigned, tone than the one in (31).

The second major difference is that for the particle *non*, Plautus as a rule echoes it together with the verb, as in the following examples.

(33)   *Adelphasium: [...] non sum irata.*
        Agorastocles: non es?
        Adelphasium: **non sum***.*
        'I'm not angry.—You aren't?—No, I'm not.' (Plautus, *Poenulus* 404)

(34)   *Periphanes:* **haec inquam est***.*
        Miles: **non haec inquam est***. non novisse me meam rere amicam posse?*
        Periphanes: hanc, **inquam***, filius meus deperibat fidicinam.*
        Miles: **haec non est ea***.*
        Periphanes: quid? **non est***?*
        Miles: **non est***.*
        'I'm telling you, this is her.—And I'm telling you, this is not her. Do you think I don't know my own girlfriend?—I'm telling you, my son was madly in love with this lyre girl.—This isn't her.—What? It isn't her?—It isn't her.' (Plautus, *Epidicus* 480–3)

Terence, on the other hand, as also observed by Thesleff (1960: 55), has no problem echoing bare *non*. I was unable to make any definite conclusions of pragmatic nature which would warrant *non sum* instead of *non* or *vice versa*. One possible explanation is that a negation particle is by default a dispreferred response and echoing it together with a verb might be an attempt to attenuate the potential threat to face by a bare and unhedged negation particle. Even though more elaborate politeness strategies are available, such as adding explanations and reasons for the negative response,[85] it might be that *non* seems less brusque and snappy, when

---

[85] See, for instance, Watts (2003); for an application to Latin, see Risselada (2021).

echoed with the verb. This fits with the example (33), where Adelphasium is trying to be explicitly polite to make Agorastocles go away. In (34), however, repeated from Section 4.2.2, the two co-interactants seem to be in a mild altercation and no politeness strategies seem to fit. Additionally, Plautine preference for aesthetic repetition applies.

Thesleff (1960: 54) thinks the absence of the *non* + verb echo from Terence is accidental; even though later he notes that the non-echoed bare *non* (i.e., a negative answer, not studied here) is much more frequent in Terence than in Plautus (Thesleff 1960: 56). In any case, when taken together with the use of other particles, it does not seem to be as easily dismissible as coincidence. Even though one cannot say for certain, why Plautus opts for adding the verb in many cases where Terence would not, the difference is intriguing, especially since it is unlikely to reflect any difference in communicative reality outside Roman comedy.[86] Perhaps the answer should be partly sought in the fact that Terence's replies are often more down to earth and realistic than those of Plautus: where Plautus has *ita hercle vero*, Terence has *ita*; where Plautus has *non edepol habeo profecto*[87], Terence tends to have a bare *non*. Even though this is a mere speculation, the idiosyncratic artistic choice is always a possibility.

4.3.1.7   Long repetition

This category concerns those cases where substantial material recoverable from the antecedent is echoed. Since the responder thus sacrifices the ease of processing, it is likely that these utterances are marked and belong, at least partly, to repetitions, not merely to the echo response. Take the following example.

(35)   *Cleostrata: [...] hanc ex longa longiorem ne faciamus fabulam.*

Lysidamus: non irata es?

Cleostrata: **non sum irata***.*

Lysidamus: tuaen fide credo?

Cleostrata: **meae***.*

'We shouldn't turn this long play into an even longer one.—You aren't

---

[86] Note that Thesleff (1960: 56) observes that *non* is probably a secondary development from *non* in an echo response. That is probably true in the cognitive sense, namely that when one utters *non*, one proceeds from the sentence answer (see Potočnik 2023: 86–87 for a short reflection; see Chapter 3 for sentence answer), but is unlikely in diachronic terms, i.e., with reference to actual passage of time, since that would imply a non-existence of the negative response particle non in Plautus' time. Neither is it likely that in Terence's time it was for some reason more acceptable to respond with a bare *non*. A bare *non*, as noted above, is usually dispreferred and in this sense, Terence's occurrences are unusual, not an organic development from *non* + verb.

[87] Plautus, *Pseudolus* 342.

angry?—No, I'm not angry.—Can I trust your word?—Yes.' (Plautus, *Casina* 1007)

The passage is from the end of the Casina, where Cleostrata, on Myrrhina's urging, forgives Lysidamus for his transgressions. Lysidamus, humiliated and apologetic, asks her an almost positively biased question whether she is angry. Instead of echoing the verbal group only, she echoes the adjective as well. She must have a pragmatic reason for it, such as sarcasm, subliminal messaging, or similar. Since by convention, comedies revert things to their original state and characters return to their original positions[88]—slaves given power ultimately end back where they started, a matron playing the role of the cunning slave, as well as that of the head of the family, as Myrrhina does in Casina, is expected to return to her original position[89]—one may assume that this is not sarcasm. It is more likely that, since it is the end of the comedy, the utterance has the quality of an authoritative, ceremonial pronouncement to signal that Lysidamus is free to become the old man of the comedy once again.

As a side note, upon Lysidamus asking whether he can trust her word, Myrrhina echoes the possessive pronoun again. It is possible that, Since Lysidamus is just recovering from being on the business end of an elaborate ruse, he is understandably sceptical, so the stress, just like in (26) above, falls on *tuaen*, which Cleostrata emphatically confirms by echoing the pronoun. On the other hand, the adjacency pair is suspiciously similar to the one encountered in (26), so it is quite possible that this is a fixed formula which found its way into many production scripts and not much should be read into the fact that the pronoun is repeated instead of the verb.

4.3.1.8 Other

This is a catch-all category. It contains the echoes of all other parts of speech, such as adjectives and adverbs, which are neither frequent nor homogeneous enough to warrant special treatment. As a group, however, together with the pronominal echo, they provide evidence for the second part of the definition of the echo response—when an element other than the verb is in question, that element is echoed—which confirms that the echo response in Latin in this sense behaves as the echo response in other languages. Take the following example.

(36)   *Syra: ergo propterea te sedulo et moneo et hortor ne quoiusquam misereat, quin spolies, mutiles, laceres quemque nacta sis.*

---

[88] E.g., McCarthy (2000: 111).
[89] See McCarthy (2000) for a study on the analysis of power and farce in *Casina*.

Philotis: utine eximium neminem habeam?

Syra: **neminem***.*

'And that's why I constantly urge and exhort you never to take pity on a lover but strip, flay, and fleece every one you get.—Without any exception at all?—None.' (Terence, *Hecyra* 63–6)

In (36), an older courtesan is giving advice to a younger one on how she should treat customers. When the younger courtesan issues the repair question whether the older one meant that she should not have a favourite client either, the latter confirms by echoing *neminem*. The emphatic interpretation applies: the old woman wants to make sure that the young and inexperienced colleague remembers the precepts well.

There are some cases to which the emphatic interpretation also seems to apply, but where it is equally likely that non-verbal elements are echoed because there is no verb.

> (37)   *Syra: supposivit.*
> *Callicles: quoi?*
> *Syra: sibi.*
> *Callicles: pro filiolon?*
> *Syra:* **pro filiolo.**
> 'She smuggled him into the family.— Whose?— Her own.— As her son?—Yes, as her son.' (Plautus, *Truculentus* 804–5)

When Syra verifies, whether the courtesan smuggled the child into her family as her son, Callicles echoes the antecedent precisely. One can imagine *pro filiolo* uttered emphatically. However, since there is no verb, that is also the only option, as far as the echo response is concerned. A response using one of the non-echo response strategies, such as *ita dixi* would get the same message across, but is perhaps again less attractive to Plautus, as it would not have the appeal of alliteration and repetition.

However, even though some examples, such as (37), are, due to presence of other factors, not valid evidence for the fourth basic property of the echo response—that the verb is echoed when the whole proposition is questioned, and the focal element is echoed, when a part of the proposition is questioned—the example (36) shows that the choice of the element to be echoed does depend on the focal element.

4.3.1.9 Summary

By far the most frequent form of the echo response is a verb in active indicative. Due to the very high frequency (almost twice the frequency of all other formal categories put together) and the fact that no pragmatic or performance factors could be identified in cases when it was used, I conclude that this must be the default positive response strategy and, additionally, saw no reason not to extend this conclusion to the Latin language in general.

The echo response realised by a verb in passive indicative was shown to be used to express personal detachment and depends on social and situational factors.

The echo response in moods other than indicative is limited to antecedents where the authority for carrying out the action is relegated to Speaker 2. They are typically not used after directives and information antecedents, because their form—imperative or subjunctive—is incompatible with the conversational exigencies established by those antecedent types. They can still be used in these environments to achieve certain pragmatic effects.

A relatively frequent formal type are pronominal echoes which, in Roman comedy, are used to provide an emphatic response. While emphatic responses are certainly compatible with the second part of the definition of the echo response, the frequency probably reflects the nature of the conversation in Roman comedy, rather than a real-life situation in Latin.

In connection with echoed particles, it was discussed whether they could provide a context for the development of the positive response particles; it was shown that that is unlikely.

Long echo responses—occurrences where more than necessary is echoed—are used in special pragmatic circumstances as well, for instance, in cases of sarcasm.

The category 'other' includes occurrences where anything not included in the categories above is echoed. The motivation for these forms is usually emphasis, but also the absence of a verb.

4.3.2 Antecedents

This section studies antecedent types. Proceeding from the overview of antecedents triggering the echo response in the corpus, it discusses each antecedent type separately, attempts to identify the form which is likely to occur after an antecedent type and, where possible, discusses cases where the echo response has functions other than providing a positive response.

Table 4.3.2a below shows the frequencies of the echo response after each antecedent type.

	Plautus	Terence
Information		
Polar question	149	39 [124.8]
Repair	77	23 [73.6]
Statement	20	4 [12.8]
Action		
Directive	139	38 [121.6]
Asking for commitment	15	1 [3.2]
Wish	4	
Intention	6	1 [3.2]
Request for permission	4	
Question on future action	20	2 [6.4]

Table 4.3.2a

In the most general terms, one can immediately observe that the echo response in the Plautine corpus occurs after a wide range of antecedents, both information and action. Except for two types (*wish* and *request for permission*), the same can be said about Terence. This indicates that the echo response was a widely applicable positive response strategy, useful in virtually all types of communicative situations. It is an indication, in other words, that the echo response was a default positive response strategy in Latin (as argued in Potočnik 2023: 78).

In terms of the distribution of the echo response within information antecedents, the highest number of occurrences are triggered by polar questions and the lowest number by statements. This is expected—the polar question is the environment which is commonly associated with positive (or negative) response strategies, while statement, which does not even demand a response, is not. However, as we will see in Section 5.2.1 of Chapter 5, the values for *ita* show the opposite state of affairs, which, despite their semantic equivalence, suggests a difference in pragmatic character between the two strategies. This distribution—clustering of the echo

response after polar questions and of *ita* after statements—is, moreover, reflected in both authors.

In action antecedents, by far the highest number of occurrences are triggered by directives. There is no reason to think that this is indicative of real linguistic situation of the Latin of the 3rd or the 2nd century BCE, but can easily be explained by the nature of the sources. The driving force of comedy is typically a slave who, due to his social position, tends to be given errands, is sent offstage or called back onstage, and he rarely has the option to refuse. The frequency is explained by the fact that the slave also receives the largest share of the dialogue (Barrios-Lech 2016: 268). Another reason for the high frequency of directives, as will be argued below, is stage management: a large share of these directives are realised by verbs of movement, such as *abi*, *sequere*, *redi*, etc., which govern the movement of characters on and off the very limited stage space.

Finally, Terence's column in the table shows that Terence is less concerned with variety of the action antecedents than Plautus. The values for minor antecedents in Terence are in general lower than in Plautus or they are absent, as in the case of *wish* and *request for permission*. Since this is replicated in antecedents to *ita* as well (see Chapter 5), it should again be explained with the nature of Terence's dialogue and not with the pragmatic properties of the echo response.

4.3.2.1 Polar question

In response to polar questions, echo response occurs 149 times in Plautus and 39 [124.8] times in Terence. Its formal distribution after polar question antecedents is as follows.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Verb in active indicative	100	18 [57.6]
Verb in non-indicative		
Pronoun	7	2 [6.4]
Pronoun + verb	12	2 [6.4]
Particle	3	4 [12.8]
Particle + verb	2	

Long repetition	2	
Other	23	13 [41.6]

Table 4.3.2b

The values which stand out for both authors are those of the categories 'verb in active indicative' and 'other'. If Table 4.3.2a above showed that the great majority of echo responses are triggered by the polar question antecedent—which established the echo response as the default positive response strategy in the most typical yes-no environment—Table 4.3.2b shows that, in both authors, most of these responses are realised by 'verb in active indicative' and 'other', which, as suggested above, indicates that the echo response in Latin conforms to the cross-linguistic definition of the echo response given at the beginning of the chapter: that the verb is echoed when the whole proposition is questioned and that when a part of the proposition is questioned, a focal element, i.e., a non-verbal, element is echoed.

Assuming that most polar questions carry neutral belief (Speaker 1 does not have an expectation regarding the truth of the proposition), and hence do not need an emphatic positive response, the ratio 'pronoun + verb' versus 'pronoun' (12:7) after polar questions might support the idea that longer responses carry less emphasis than bare pronouns. The ratio in Terence (2:2) is inconclusive in that regard.

We know that the polar question antecedent can trigger both the echo and the non-echo positive response strategies, but also that the echo response is much more frequent in this context than the non-echo responses (see Potočnik 2023: 74, Tables 3 and 4). One way of looking at this is that, at the time of production, any member of the language community was more likely to hear the echo response than the non-echo response in this context, which, in turn, makes the speaker more likely to reproduce the pattern. This self-perpetuating entrenchment of a linguistic pattern in a speech community is one factor which drives these statistics, but does not in itself explain why the echo response is the more likely choice in this context. In an attempt to get closer to the answer, we should take a closer look at the polar question antecedents which trigger the echo response realised by the verbal echo. Let us re-examine (15) from above, repeated here as (38).

(38)   *Leonida: eho, ecquis pro vectura olivi rem solvit?*
        *Libanus: **solvit**.*
        'Hey, did anyone pay for shipping the oil?—Yes.' (Plautus, *Asinaria* 433)

In terms of what this question 'does', we can see that it is a typical representative of its class in that Leonida lacks a piece of information and seeks to obtain it from Libanus. The information sought is 'whether (it is true that) someone paid for shipping the oil'. From where Leonida and Libanus are standing, this is an objective, factual piece of information, since the shipping was paid for (or not) before the time of speaking and it depends on neither of the co-interactants, but rather on a state of affairs outside the conversation.

However, it is obviously not always the case that polar questions concern the exchange of factual, objective pieces of information which exist independently and before the time of speaking. Glossing over the theory of indirect speech acts[90] and focusing instead on the type of information exchanged in Halliday's (1984) terms, let us look at (39), repeated from Section 3.4.1:

(39)   *Leonida: [...]* **meministine asinos Arcadicos mercatori Pelleo**
          nostrum vendere atriensem?
          Libanus: memini. quid tum postea?
          'Do you remember that our steward sold donkeys from Arcadia to a merchant
          from Pella?—I do. What next?' (Plautus, *Asinaria* 333–5)

The antecedent in (39) is still a polar question, but it is quite clear that the status of the information being exchanged (*whether Libanus remembers the donkeys*) is different from the information in (38). While shipping the oil was paid for before the time of speaking, Libanus might only have remembered the donkeys upon being prompted by Leonida; even if he never really forgot it, the fact that the information was stored in his memory is still different from the fact that someone might have paid for shipping the oil. The other noticeable difference is that the information is limited to the co-interactants and does not depend on actions by third persons or external states of affairs; the co-interactants are co-creating the information at the time of speaking.

It is in these two ways—the fact that the information is not completed by the time of speaking, and the involvement of the co-interactants—that the information being exchanged in (39) differs from the information in (38). If in (38), Leonida's illocutionary intent was genuinely to obtain the factual piece of information, his intent in (39) was less to obtain the (dubious) piece of information than to prepare the ground for the realisation of his real intent, that is, to engage

---

[90] For indirect speech acts see Searle (1979).

in the subsequent conversation. We might call exchanges, exemplified by (38) *content-oriented*, and those by (39) *procedural*.[91]

My aim here is to see whether content-orientedness or proceduralness has any impact on the response they receive. However, the polar questions are unlikely to fall neatly into the two categories, so in order to avoid subjective judgement, I shall translate the two observations about the character of the information being exchanged into observable indicators in the following way:

- Information concluded before the time of speaking > the main verb in past tense;
- Information not concluded before the time of speaking > the main verb in non-past tense;
- Co-interactants are involved > the main verb in the 1st or the 2nd person;
- Co-interactants are not involved > the main verb in the 3rd person.

Upon analysis of the sets of polar questions triggering a verb in indicative in Plautus and in Terence (100 and 18 tokens, respectively) the following emerges:

	Plautus				Terence			
	1st or 2nd person	*3rd person*	*Non-past tense*	*Past tense*	*1st or 2nd person*	*3rd person*	*Non-past*	*Past*
Form of verb in polar question	86	14	79	21	11	7	11	7

Table 4.3.2c

In Plautus, out of 100 polar questions, 86 of them have the verb in the 1st or 2nd person and 14 in the 3rd person; 79 have the verb in tenses other than past and 21 have the verb in past tense. In Terence, out of 18 polar questions, 11 of them have the verb in the 1st or 2nd person and 7 in the 3rd person; 11 have the verb in tenses other than past and 7 have the verb in past tense.

Table 4.3.2ca shows how the 1st/2nd vs. 3rd person split correlates with the tenses.

---

[91] Such conversation starters are of course not the only non-content-oriented antecedents (cf. greetings, such as in *valen?*).

	Plautus		Terence	
	Non-past tense	*Past tense*	*Non-past tense*	*Past tense*
1st or 2nd person	70	16	5	6
3rd person	8	6	6	1

Table 4.3.2ca

The 1st/2nd set for Plautus shows a clear correlation between person and tense. The rest of the values are too low to support any conclusion.

Based on these data, I conclude that polar questions which trigger the verbal echo are far more similar to (39) than to (38): the information exchanged is likely to be atypical in that it is not concluded by the time of speaking and involves one or both co-interactants, rather than a third person.

It should be noted that, in an effort to tie my conclusions to clear indicators in the corpus, I have glossed over the fact that a perfect tense frequently denotes a state or action extending into the present;[92] a verb in the present often denotes factual information;[93] a verb in the 1st or 2nd person does not guarantee that the information is not factual[94] and, conversely, a verb in the 3rd person does not guarantee that it is.[95] This, however does not negate the existence of a trend. When the verb in present denotes factual information, it is often in the 3rd person; and when the verb in the 2nd person denotes factual information it is often in past tense. The values in Table *4.3.2.1b* are therefore convincing enough to postulate the following trend in the use of the echo response after polar questions:

If the verbal action in the polar question concerns one of the addressees or if the information in question is less factual, the polar question is likely to receive the echo response.

In practice, this means that a polar question of the type 'do you…' is more likely to receive an echo response than that of the type 'is it true that…').

---

[92] *benene usque valuisti?—a morbo valui, ab animo aeger fui.* 'Have you been well throughout?—Physically, yes, mentally, no' (Plautus, *Epidicus* 129).
[93] *sed ecqua ancilla est illi?—est prime cata.* 'But does she have some maid?—She does, a very clever one.' (Plautus *Miles gloriosus* 794).
[94] *ecquam tu advexti tuae matri ancillam e Rhodo?—advexi.* 'You brought some maid from Rhodes for your mother?—I did' (Plautus, *Mercator* 390–1).
[95] *potin est ab amico alicunde exorari?—potest.* 'Is it possible that some friend could be prevailed upon?—Yes' (Plautus, *Trinummus* 759).

Returning back to the Table *4.3.2b*, it shows that a significant number of occurrences are realised by non-verbal echoes. This is relevant for the fourth basic property of the echo response, which states that the verb is echoed when the whole proposition is questioned, and the focal element, when a part of the proposition is questioned. The first part is confirmed by the fact that in examples such as (38), when the verb is echoed, the whole proposition is questioned. And even though not all occurrences of non-verbal echo (such as (37) in the previous section) are valid evidence that the second part holds as well, for most examples in the corpus it is possible to show, as in the case of (36), that the echoed part corresponds to the focal element in the antecedent.

4.3.2.2 Repair

The verbal echo response is a default positive response strategy in the echo-based systems and should therefore not be inherently emphatic. Since the repair antecedent requires an emphatic positive response, the behaviour of the echo response in this environment should be the principal source of data to establish whether this basic property holds for Latin as well.

In response to polar questions, echo response occurs 77 times in Plautus and 22 [70.4] times in Terence. The formal distribution of echo responses after repair antecedents is as follows.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Verb in active indicative	23	5 [16]
Verb in non-indicative	1	
Pronoun	28	10 [32]
Pronoun + verb	3	
Particle	3	4 [12.8]
Particle + verb	2	
Long repetition	1	
Other	16	3 [9.6]

Table 4.3.2d

Most echo responses triggered by repair antecedents are realised by a pronoun, which is the main piece of evidence that the pronominal echo is inherently emphatic. This finding is strengthened by the fact that the same state of affairs is found in both Plautus and Terence, and the fact that pronouns play a role in emphasis in other languages (see Section 3.2.1 of Chapter 3).

If the possibility of fixed dialogic formulas should always be kept in mind, this is especially true for the pronominal echo response. This is not to say that the pattern *ego?—tu* is unnatural in any way; only that its values in the corpus are likely to be inflated by copying of this theatrically efficient pattern from one play to another. Still, the frequency-based conclusions regarding the pronominal echo response cannot be extended to the Latin language outside of the Roman comedy in the same way as it was possible for the verbal echo response.

While the pronominal echo is not taken here as reflecting the current speech of the time, the verbal echo is, so its use after repair antecedent is potentially more interesting. If it was non-emphatic, one would in principle not expect it in this environment; however, it has significant presence and comes second by token values, immediately after the pronominal echo.

First of all, its mere presence after a repair antecedent does not negate the idea that the verbal echo is neutral. Even though the repair antecedent *requires* an emphatic response, it does not necessarily receive it and when this is the case, the flow of conversation is not necessarily disrupted because of it. Ideally, however, all conclusions regarding the pragmatic character of the echo response in this chapter should be based on evidence from the corpus, so it is worth briefly discussing any explicit evidence which would point to the degree of emphasis in verbal echoes following a repair.

If the verbal echo response is inherently neutral, the emphasis should be *imposed* on the echo response by other means and intensifying strategies offer themselves as the likely candidate to achieve this. It does turn out that 13 out of 23 occurrences in Plautus and 3 out of 5 in Terence are accompanied by an intensified strategy. However, in Section 4.3.1, it was suggested— mainly based on the fact that they co-occur with inherently emphatic strategies such as the pronominal echo—that their use should be explained idiomatically, rather than pragmatically; in such a case, the idiomatic explanation cannot be excluded here either, so I will not base any conclusions on them.

The most readily available resource for providing emphasis in any language are suprasegmental, such as intonation. Even though it is likely that intonation was present in the Latin conversation, it eludes systematic study in corpus languages. One does occasionally find clues to it, such as in (40):

(40)   *Davus: […] o Chreme, per tempus advenis. ausculta.*
        Chremes: audivi iam omnia.
        Davus: anne haec tu omnia?
        *Chremes: **audivi**, inquam, a principio.*
        'Oh, Chremes! You're just in time. Listen.—I've already heard everything.—
        You have? Everything?—I tell you, I heard it from the beginning.' (Terence,
        Andria 783–5)

Chremes, who is annoyed by Davus' questioning, must have uttered the second *audivi* more loudly and in a more pronounced manner. Such a pile-up of questions and repairs, responded to by a series of identical positive responses is a frequent pattern[96] and the gradation of volume and intonational cues is very likely or even necessary.

The following example, where Lycus refers to his hoarse voice is one of the rare explicit references to intonation and volume:

(41)   *Agorastocles: negasne apud te esse aurum nec servom meum?*
        *Lycus: **nego**: et negando, si quid refert, **aruio**.*
        'Do you deny that my gold and my slave are with you?—Yes, I do deny it; and
        I'm hoarse from denying it, for that matter.' (Plautus, *Poenulus* 777–8)

The likelihood of emphasis by intonation indicates that the significant presence of verbal echoes after repair antecedents does not contradict the possibility of its neutral character, established as one of the principal properties of the echo response.

However, in general terms, the data in Table 4.3.2d are still consistent with the idea that the repair antecedent requires or expects an emphatic echo response, as illustrated by the high values in the categories 'Pronoun' (inherently emphatic) and 'Other', which contains other non-verbal elements echoed.

---

[96] Terence, *Phormio* 353–6.

4.3.2.3 Statement

The characteristic feature of the statement antecedent is that it does not invite a response; an important consequence of this is that the speaker does not designate the next holder of the conversational floor. Speaker 2 then self-designates as the next speaker to take the floor; or they only provide linguistic feedback—to signal their attention to the speaker and thus their active participation in the conversation, without trying to take the floor. Based on the data in the corpus, the echo response participates in both of these functions. Before discussing them in more detail, Table 4.3.2e below provides the formal distribution of echo responses triggered by the statement antecedent.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Verb in active indicative	10	3 [9.6]
Verb in non-indicative	1	
Pronoun	1	
Pronoun + verb	2	
Particle		
Particle + verb	1	
Long repetition	2	1 [3.2]
Other	3	

Table 4.3.2e

The predominant form is the verbal echo, with comparable shares in both authors. The dominance of verbal echo in this context is not unexpected. Based on similarities with the adjacency pair *polar question—positive response* (see Schegloff 1972: 77), one can assume that the whole proposition is 'in question', and as was argued above, the most appropriate strategy—because it is neutral—is the verbal echo response.

In (42), where Demea is making a case for his brother Micio to mary Aeschius' wife, Micio impatiently interrupts him by echoing the main verb and adding additional content.

119

(42)   *Demea: [...] primum huius uxorist mater.*

        *Micio: **est**. quid postea?*

        'First of all, his wife has a mother.—She has. What of it?' (Terence, *Adelphoe* 929)

In the first place, it is definitely the case that Micio is, by echoing *est*, providing a positive response, even though none was requested. However, *est* functions as a turn-taking device as well. The truth of Speaker 1's statement and its possibility to be confirmed is, in a certain sense, the weak point in their ability to hold the conversational floor; among the potential speakers, there is bound to be someone who will politely confirm their statement and, in a sort of bait-and-switch manoeuvre, take the floor and introduce their own turns of varying lengths, depending on their intentions. In this case, Micio is only trying to rush Demea to get to the point.

Others forms—that is, non-verbal or longer—of the echo response after statements are again pragmatically conditioned and the form of the echo response is determined by the element in focus.

(43)   *Alcesimarchus: [...] sed ego primum, tot qui ab amica abesse potuerim dies, sum nihili.*

        *Servus: **nihili hercle vero es**.*

        Alcesimarchus: quam ego amarem perdite, quae me amaret contra.

        Servus: dignus hercle es infortunio.

        'But first of all I'm worthless because I could endure being away from my girlfriend for so many days.—Yes, you are worthless.' (Plautus, *Cistellaria* 237–9)

The young man Alcesimarchus is feeling down, so he asks his slave to speak disapprovingly to him. The slave fulfils the task by providing feedback on Alcesimarchus' own self-deprecating comment by echoing *nihili*. On one level, the humour derives from the fact that Alcesimarchus is holding the floor and the slave is not trying to take it from him—since as a slave he had no right to it anyway (Berger 2020b: 27–8)—thereby showing deference to his master. The dissonance comes from the fact that the comments in the slave's turns are actually disrespectful. However, a separate level of humour derives from the familiar casualness of the conversational pattern, where one party is usually telling a story and the other is nodding approvingly, adding an encouraging positive remark here and there; in our case, however, the casually interspersed

remarks are decidedly non-casual. The first level of humour, then, is based on the audiences' knowledge about the social hierarchy and the expected conversational behaviour of different classes; the other is based on their pragmatic knowledge or experience with storytelling and active listenership.

While the polar question antecedent triggers the prototypical function of positive response strategies—providing positive polarity to the binary set proposed by Speaker 1 or, in other words, saying *yes*—statement antecedent shows that positive response strategy tokens can be used in interactional functions, such as feedback and turn-taking.[97] This assumption of interactional functions by positive response strategies is comparable to adverbs assuming discourse marker functions. What examples such as (42) above illustrate, however, is that positive response functions and interactional functions are not necessarily, or indeed ever, separable. *Est* in *est, quid postea?* is a turn-taking device, but could never function as such if it did not provide a positive response at the same time. While in *well, shall we go?* one does not perceive the primary meaning of *well*, *est* is no less a positive response than it is a turn-taking device. Hence it is never really possible to say that a positive response strategy has shed the positive response function and entered the sphere of conversation management. According to the data from the corpus the echo response does, to some degree, occur in interactional management, but less frequently than the non-echo responses.

This, finally, does not mean that all positive response triggered by statements have interactional functions: sometimes Speaker 2 does genuinely want to provide a positive response, as we will see in Section 5.2.1 of Chapter 5.

4.3.2.4 Directive

There are several types of action antecedents which can trigger the echo response, by far the most common one being the directive antecedent. Formal distribution is as follows.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Verb in active indicative	109	27 [86.4]
Verb in non-indicative	15	4 [12.8]

---

[97] Cf. Berger (2020a: 155), who, from the opposite site, observes the same, noting that positive response strategies in feedback functions (referred to as *backchannels* by him) are sometimes actual agreements.

Verb in passive indicative	8	1 [3.2]
Long repetition	3	
Other	1	1 [3.2]

Table 4.3.2f

Most occurrences in both authors are again in indicative. The values in Terence are somewhat lower, which could indicate a lower incidence of directives in general; however, this cannot be substantiated with values.

In terms of tense of the verbal echoes here, one expects them to be in either present or future. If they are in the past tense, they are not positive responses. It turns out that most occurrences in indicative are in the present tense (91), while only 18 are in the future tense. Since the future tense is not incompatible with immediate completion, this is not obvious. It might be that the present tense expresses a stronger willingness to comply as in (44):

(44)   *Diabolus: placent profecto leges. sequere intro.*
       *Parasitus: **sequor**.*
       'I do like your terms. Follow me in.—I'm following you.' (Plautus, *Asinaria* 809)

Diabolus' parasite has just finished drafting the contract specifying allowed behaviours of the courtesan whom Diabolus intends to hire. After expressing approval, he orders the parasite to follow him, to which the latter agrees by echoing the verb *sequere*. The response of the parasite—whose complete obsequiousness is expected by both Diabolus and the audience—would presumably be less effective is he expressed his agreement with *sequar*. A handful of examples to the contrary do exist (however, they do not cancel a trend).[98]

By studying the set of verbs triggered by directives, one discovers that it is very homogeneous. The variety of topics discussed in conversation and actions accomplished by conversation is such that, intuitively, one would not expect a predominance of only two verbs in any corpus—despite the caveats regarding the Roman comedy as a linguistic source in Section 2.2.1 of Chapter 2. Yet, in Plautus, out of 139 occurrences of echo responses triggered by directive antecedents, 62 of them—almost half—include verbs of movement, in a large majority *eo* and

---

[98] Plautus, *Menaechmi* 215–6.

sequor and a handful of other verbs (*adeo*, *adsum*, *gradior*). The respective numbers for Terence are 14 [44.8] out of 38 [121.6], which is less than half, but still more than a third (these ratios, it should be noted, include all occurrences triggered by a directive, and not only those in indicative).

This overwhelming dominance of two verbs can be explained by the fact that that adjacency pairs *sequere—sequor* and *abi—eo* are stock forms with a precisely determined function when seen in the context of stage action and the physical realities of performance. The following example of metatheatre illustrates the physical realities of performance well.

(45)   *Nicobulus: dic, scelerum caput, dic, quo in periclo est meus Mnesilochus filius?*
Chrysalus: **sequere hac me, faxo iam scies.**
Nicobulus: quo gentium?
Chrysalus: tris unos passus.
Nicobulus: **vel decem.**
'Tell me, you hardened criminal, tell me, what danger is my son Mnesilochus in?—Follow me this way, I'll make sure that you'll know. (walks toward Bacchis' house)—Where on earth?—Only three steps.—Ten if you want.'
(Plautus, *Bacchides* 829–32)

The exchange consists of the main pair, extended by an inter-expansion. While the main pair is an example of a directive, followed by the implicit positive response, we are now primarily interested in the inter-expansion.

In the antecedent, the slave Chrysalus directs Nicobulus, who is looking for his lost son, to follow him. Instead of the customary *sequor*, however, Nicobulus, an old man, who is, furthermore, ill-disposed towards Chrysalus, opts for the question *quo gentium?* 'where on Earth?' This expansion is a breach of convention which the audience would perceive as salient, since they have heard on so many occasions the addressee, in Plautus most frequently a lower or a submissive character, respond with the customary echo response of compliance. Chrysalus responds with *tris unos passus* 'just three steps'. This is a case of metatheatre which would elicit laughter. The destination was Bacchis' house, which on the generic stage could actually have been just three steps away from their present location. Nicobulus offers a rejoinder to the inter-expansion, which continues the joke: *vel decem* '[I'll even follow] ten steps, if necessary'. The reference is to the world beyond the stage, which is further away than Bacchis' house, but

not much: ten steps would have taken him well beyond the area of the performance. Actually, since Nicobulus and Pistoclerus' house was on the right side of the stage,[99] and Bacchis' house on the left, the movement was towards the left. Since the street to the left customarily leads off the stage to the harbour, ten steps might lead very far indeed.

This example of a doubly funny meta-theatre illustrates an important reality of the stage world of the Roman comedy: the confined space. The two or three houses were three steps apart, the insides of the houses probably no more than that, and the vast offstage world was less than ten steps away. It is easy to imagine the commotion which ensued with more than two people onstage. However, this physical shortcoming deterred neither Plautus, nor Terence, nor other playwrights from writing action-packed comedies with frequent entrances and exits, changes of scenery, and invisible people on the stage which were not seen by other characters, but still had to stand somewhere. There was no need for plausibility: both space and time were elastic (Marshall 2019: 89), a certain degree of 'willing collusion' was required (Fraenkel 2007: 145) and, as (45) shows, even welcome. However, to manage the hustle and bustle onstage and for the audience to be able to follow the multi-layered theatre, some management strategies were required, and it seems that exchanges such as *sequere—sequor* and *abi—eo* were one such strategy, where the antecedent *sequere* was a cue for the actor and the response *sequor* was a cue for the audience. The high frequency of these adjacency pairs can therefore be explained by the realities of the stage as well as by the social realities of the world of Roman comedy.

Returning to Table 4.3.2f, the second row presents the values for verbs in moods other than indicative and triggered by directives. They present a much smaller set and can be exemplified by (46):

(46)   *Amphitruo: […] Alcumena, unum rogare te volo.*
         *Alcumena: quidvis [rogare] **roga**.*
         'Alcumena, I want to ask you one thing.—Ask anything you like.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 708)

Beside the mood of the two verbs, the difference between the responses in (44) and (46) can also be analysed in terms of conversational power. While in (44), the slave has no power to

---

[99] De Melo (2011: 364).

hold or manipulate the conversational floor, Alcumena is an example of a powerful matron; she has the power to keep the floor or give it away, as she does.

This naturally invites reflection on the social status of the co-interactants which is analysed in Chapter 6. The examples (44) and (46), and Table 4.3.2f suggest that responses to directives fall into two broad types: echo responses of compliance, expressed by a verb in indicative, usually in present tense, and echo responses in imperative. The former is, by hypothesis, more appropriate for lower characters, the latter for the higher.

The echo response of compliance is the more curious of the two. First of all, after action antecedents, verbalising the echo response is, strictly speaking, redundant. After information antecedents, the utterer of the antecedent requires the echo response; what the utterer of an action antecedent requires, however, is the action. Yet, despite this redundancy, the echo response—and other positive responses, in Roman comedy and in general—do occur and are a regular feature of communication. It follows that they must be motivated by other factors.[100] The imperative *roga* in (46)—which could be analysed as linguistic feedback in terms of Conversation Analysis—encourages Amphitruo to ask his question. For the echo response of compliance, I could identify no such conversation management function, because in most cases the utterers have no right to participate in conversation management. The only motivations I could identify were stage management, discussed above, or deliberate expression of submission.

I would like to suggest that the echo response of compliance constitutes a narrower subtype of the echo response, limited to the theatre-speak of Roman Comedy. In the following I define it more closely:

- If the echo response is in the past tense, it cannot be considered an echo response of compliance, since the action has already been carried out and Speaker 2 is merely informing Speaker 1 that the action has already been carried out.[101] Thus, an echo response of compliance can be in the present (including perfect tense when it carries the present meaning[102]) or possibly future tense;

---

[100] See Zerbino (2013).
[101] Terence, *Hecyra* 466–7; Terence, *Hecyra* 842–3.
[102] Terence, *Adelphoe* 794–5.

- Similarly, the echo response of compliance is usually in the indicative mood. The numerous cases of the imperative echo response and of the echo response in subjunctive mood generally presuppose some authority and are thus incompatible with compliance;

- There are several verbs which cannot be considered echo responses of compliance on semantic grounds, such as *sine—sino*, in which case the authority is clearly on the side of the addressee and no submission is involved;

- In terms of persons involved, the echo response of compliance is in a great majority of cases uttered in the first person, but not necessarily. Since the directive can refer to a completion of an action by a third person, the speaker can take it upon themselves to make sure that they will act upon that third person to carry out the desired action, in which case one can still speak of the echo response of compliance.

In Plautus, the following verbs appear in the echo response of compliance: *abeo*, *aspicio*, *assum*, *audio*, *capio*, *concedo*, *dico*, *eo*, *facio*, *fugio*, *mitto*, *omitto*, *oro*, *redeo*, *sequor*, *taceo*, *tango*, *teneo*. In Terence, the following verbs appear: *abeo*, *audio*, *ausculto*, *duco*, *effero*, *eo*, *facio*, *fero*, *libero*, *maneo*, *moveo*, *omitto*, *quaero*, *recipio*, *reddo*, *sequor*, *voco*.

The following examples are representative of the strategy.

(47)   *Euclio: tace atque abi intro.*

           Staphyla: ***taceo atque abeo***.

           'Be quiet and go inside.—Yes, I am quiet and I am going.' (Plautus, *Aulularia* 103)

(48)   *Davus: […] nempe hoc sic esse opinor. dicturum patrem "ducas volo hodie uxorem;" tu "**ducam**" inquies.*

           'Davus: This is the situation as I see it. Your father will say "I want you to marry today." You'll say "All right."' (Terence, *Andria* 387–8)

(49)   *Pamphilus: sequere me intro, Parmeno.*

           Parmeno: ***sequor***. *equidem plus hodie boni feci imprudens quam sciens ante hunc diem umquam.*

           'Follow me inside, Parmeno.—I'm coming. Truly, I've done more good today unwittingly than I've ever done on purpose before.' (Terence, *Hecyra* 879–80)

In (47), Euclio, an old man, orders the old woman Staphyla to shut up and go inside, to which she responds with *taceo atque abeo* 'I am shutting up and I'm going inside'. The woman is his housekeeper, so the old man has the authority to send her away. This is also reflected in her

reply, which is distinctly non-naturalistic, in that the old woman repeats every word from the antecedent. In English, the exact repetition of the whole antecedent usually has a special connotation, such as registering one's disapproval of the order or sarcasm.

In (48), Davus the slave is imagining a conversation between a father and a son, where the father expresses the wish that the son should take a wife. The son is supposed to respond with *ducam* 'I will take [a wife]'. Such examples are significant for a linguistic analysis—when one character is putting words in the mouth of another, he or she is likely to adopt the speech patterns and exaggerate it. Since in this imaginary case there is no other motivation present except for willingness or obligation to submit to the father's wishes and since this is a quotation, I consider this evidence that the echo response of compliance is customarily used in unequal social relationships.

In (49), Pamphilus orders his slave Parmeno to follow him inside, to which Parmeno replies with *sequor* 'I am following'. As in (47), the positive response strategy is the character's (or the actor's) cue to leave the stage. However, while in (47), Staphyla leaves immediately after her positive response, Parmeno does not leave immediately; he stays on the stage for at least a few seconds longer to address the audience and only then leaves. Since this is the last statement before the 'curtain call', it is even possible that he doesn't leave the stage at all, but waits for the rest of the troupe to join him onstage. In either case, *sequor* seems to be a *pro forma* response to one's superior, while the required action is not performed immediately.

Since this subtype of the echo response seems to be especially sensitive to social considerations, it is analysed, together with *fiat*, in Chapter 6.

4.3.2.5 Asking for commitment

There are 15 cases in Plautus and one [3.2] in Terence. This type of antecedent mostly triggers speech acts of promise. They are realised with verbal echoes in present indicative, mostly realised by performative verbs, such as *spondeo* and *fidem do*. In such cases, the echo response is the predominant positive response strategy, although there are two cases where betrothal is performed by *fiat*.[103]

---

[103] Plautus, *Curculio* 673; Plautus *Aulularia* 241.

4.3.2.6 Wish

These are expressions of wish regarding one of the participants. The responses are realised by imperative echo responses if the wish concerns Speaker 1[104] or in the 1st person if the wish concerns Speaker 2 (*utinam possies…—possum* 'I hope you can…—I can.' Plautus, *Menaechmi* 1104–5). There are only four occurrences in Plautus and none in Terence.

4.3.2.7 Intention

All of the echo responses triggered by intention antecedents trigger imperative echo responses, since this is the only felicitous option.[105]

4.3.2.8 Request for permission

Plautus has four cases, Terence, has none. This antecedent type only differs from intention antecedents in the locus of authority, which may have more to do with politeness than actual authority; in (46), Amphitruo was likely to ask the question regardless of the answer. Two cases out of four could represent the original context for the development of the *licet* positive response strategy (*licet…—licet*[106]; see Section 5.2.4 of Chapter 5).

4.3.2.9 Question on future action

This antecedent type differs from the polar question in the fact that the state of affairs in question is in the future. It is, nevertheless, impossible to draw a clear line between the two. Compare the following two examples:

(50)   *Parmeno: maneamne usque ad vesperum?*
        Pamphilus: **maneto**. *curre.*
        'Am I to stay there right until evening?'—Yes, stay. Now run.' (Terence,
        Hecyra 442)

(51)   *Misargyrides: reddeturne igitur faenus?*
        Tranio: **reddet**: *nunc abi.*
        'Will I be paid the interest then?—He'll pay; now go away.' (Plautus,
        Mostellaria 580)

---

[104] *lubet pellegere has—pellege.* 'I wish to read through it.—Do' (Plautus, *Bacchides* 986–7).
[105] *eo ego—i sane* 'I am going—Do go' (Plautus, *Persa* 198).
[106] Plautus, *Casina* 457.

In the section on polar question antecedents, it was shown that in most questions triggering the echo response the information concerns one of the co-interactants. On this basis it was argued that the echo response confirms atypical information. While in (50) and (51), the information in question is atypical in both cases, since it concerns the future, it seems that in (51), where the action depends on a third person, is closer to typical information that in (50). In other words, while (50) would not typically receive a non-echo response, this seems more likely in (51). A considerable number of occurrences (10 in Plautus and one [3.2] in Terence) are realised by the pattern *vin…—volo*[107] and it sems that a certain degree of conventionalisation was underway.

4.3.2.10 Summary

The most frequent antecedent triggering an echo response is the polar question antecedent. However, the echo response is an appropriate response to virtually all types of antecedents identified in the corpus, which translates to all types of communicative situations in the real world. This is taken as an indication that the echo response was the default positive response strategy in Latin.

In terms of distribution of the echo response within the information antecedents, the highest number of occurrences are triggered by polar questions and the lowest number by statements. Taken together with the non-echo responses, in which I observe the opposite state of affairs, this indicates a difference in pragmatic character.

Regarding the polar question antecedents, it was revealed that most conversations where the polar question triggers the echo response do not concern the exchange of typical, objective information existing prior to the exchange, but rather some state of affairs or action where one of the participants is involved. Based on this, I suggested the existence of the following trend: if the verbal action in the polar question concerns one of the addressees or if the information in question is less factual, the polar question is likely to receive the echo response.

The repair antecedent mostly triggers the pronominal echo response, which indicates that the pronominal echo response is inherently emphatic. It was also suggested that the significant presence of the verbal echo response after repair antecedent—which requires an emphatic positive response due to negative belief—is not incompatible with the idea that the verbal echo response is neutral or non-emphatic, because the emphasis can be added to it by other means, such as intonation. All of this speaks to the fact that the echo response is, by itself, non-

---

[107] Plautus, *Mercator* 485.

emphatic. While the presence of intensifiers was predicted to be a clue regarding the emphasis of a positive response strategy, it was shown that intensifiers depend on idiomatic factors or on idiosyncratic preferences of authors, so no conclusions are possible based on them.

Statement antecedent reveals interactional functions of positive response strategies. It was shown that the echo response can occur as a turn-taking strategy and as a feedback strategy; neither of these is separable from the positive response function.

In action antecedents, by far the highest number of occurrences are triggered by directive antecedents, which is taken to reflect the social reality in the Roman comedy, where the lower stock characters, especially the slaves, which are likely to receive directives, are allocated the largest part of the dialogue.

I observed that the majority of exchanges *directive—echo response* in both authors are realised by verbs of movement, such as *sequere—sequor*. It was suggested that these serve as cues for actors to move about the stage in an efficient manner and for the audience to be able to follow the action onstage more easily.

Based on the social reality in the Roman comedy, I also suggested the existence of the echo response of compliance, a special subtype of the echo response, which, apart from providing agreement to a directive, assumed a special role of expressing submission. I then attempted to define the subtype more closely. The social distribution of the echo response of compliance is discussed in Chapter 6.

Finally, quantitative data is given for minor action antecedents regarding their formal realisations. Due to low values, no pragmatic trends could be identified except for those which follow naturally from the nature of the exchange (e.g., the fact that an echo response to an offer can only be realised by the imperative mood).

4.4   Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to study the echo response in Plautus and Terence—the positive response provided by repetition of the relevant element from the antecedent.

Before analysing the occurrences of the echo response in the corpus, I discussed its presence in other languages, as well as its relationship to repetition and the ensuing methodological difficulties. It was shown that the echo response can take many forms, that it can be present to

different degrees in languages, and that its use depends on several levels of factors, from semantic and pragmatic to social. Based on the development of a quasi-particle *ga* from the echo response in a dialect of Slovenian, it was demonstrated that there exists a link between the echo and the non-echo response in that a realisation of the echo response can become conventionalised and start being used in other contexts, where it does not echo anything from the antecedent.

In terms of the relationship of the echo response with the act of repetition, a distinction was made between the echo response as a linguistic resource and the act of repetition. It was concluded that due to the nature of the corpus, which contains both, a description of the echo response as a grammatical resource will not be possible to the extent to which it is possible for modern languages; it was, however, shown that one can to some extent differentiate between the echo response and otherwise motivated repetition.

Since the echo response is used much more frequently than the non-echo responses, and is present after all types of antecedents encountered in the corpus, I conclude that the echo response is suitable for all communicative situations where a positive response is likely to occur and is therefore a default positive response strategy in Latin.

The highest number of occurrences of the echo response are triggered by polar questions, which are assumed to be neutral in terms of belief; this means that usually they do not require an emphatic positive response. This is understood as evidence that the echo is inherently non-emphatic. The fact that the echo response can also be used in environments which need an emphatic positive response—such as repair antecedents—does not contradict this finding, because special linguistic features are available to provide emphasis when needed—the pronominal echo response, observed in the corpus, and intonation, which cannot be observed in the corpus, but was likely available.

While a whole range of potential forms of the echo response exists and a whole range of them was identified and discussed in this study, it was shown that in all environments, the verbal echo response is dominant. This allows us to restate the finding on the defaultness of the echo response, formulated in Potočnik (2023): the default positive response strategy was not actually the echo response *tout court*, but the verbal echo response, that is, echoing the verb in active indicative. Due to the inadequacy of the concept of *word*—is the echo response *non sum* one word or two?—I did not provide exact values for one- or two-word echoes, but in the majority of cases in my corpus, only the main verb is echoed. In almost all cases where additional

material is present, pragmatic reasons can be identified. This is, in my opinion, sufficient to confirm that the third basic property of the echo response—one word echoed—holds for Latin.

Finally, the last basic property states that the verb is repeated when the whole proposition is questioned, and the relevant element when only one part of the proposition is questioned. As other properties, this one is also based on adjacency pairs *polar question—echo response*. The first part was conclusively established when it was demonstrated that no pragmatic factors are needed to trigger the verbal echo response. The second part can be established by observing non-verbal echo responses triggered by the polar question antecedent, especially from the categories 'pronoun' and 'other'. In these cases, the context in most cases allows to assume that the stress is on a non-verbal part of the antecedent—i.e., on the part which is the focal element of the proposition. The fourth property thus holds for Latin as well.

While it was not yet possible to formulate constraints on the echo response as a part of grammar, this confirms that the echo response is nevertheless a part of Latin grammar and that it is comparable to the echo response as described for modern languages.

5 Non-Echo Responses: *Ita, Sic, Fiat, Licet, and Etiam*

5.1 Introduction

Non-echo positive responses have been defined as positive responses which formally cannot be traced to the antecedent (Jones 1999: 17). That is, instead of echoing some material from the antecedent, they introduce a new lexeme or a group of lexemes (see also Potočnik 2023: 81).

As suggested in Chapter 2, non-echo responses, as attested in our corpus, should be subdivided into pro-forms (e.g., *I do*; *faciam*), positive response particles (e.g., *yes*, *oui*, *da*), implicit positive responses (e.g., *eho, an inuenisti Bacchidem?—Samiam quidem*;[108] *Is it raining?— And how!*) and emphatic positive responses (*very much so*), other conventional responses (*quidni*) and other (unpredictable) responses (*this sounds correct*). Each subcategory certainly deserves dedicated scrutiny, as each one of them holds valuable information on language change, conventionalisation, and underlying structures of conversation. In this chapter, only constructions *ita*, *sic*, *fiat*, *licet*, and *etiam* are studied. *Ita*, *sic*, and *etiam* have sporadically been considered as positive response particles (Thesleff 1960; Pinkster 1972: 140); I include *fiat* and *licet*; because they seem to be rare examples of linguistic 'congruence' in action-oriented contexts (Halliday 1984).

I refer to the constructions in question as *potential* positive response particles, because it is, first of all, uncertain whether any positive response particle in the modern sense existed in Latin; and secondly, because positive response particles can share some properties established in Chapter 3, but not all. This means that potential positive response particles can be imagined on a gradient. At the end of it there is, for instance, the group of particles, which includes *yes*, to which all basic properties apply (formally fixed, non-emphatic, utterance-peripheral, providing no more than polarity); before it, there are *sim*, and *joo*, discussed in Section 3.2.2 of Chapter 3, to which the property 'non-emphatic' does not apply); further towards the beginning there is the Slovenian *ga*, discussed in Section 4.2.1, which is particle-like, but cannot be used in all contexts; finally; at the very beginning of this gradient there are pro-forms of the type of *I do*, *faciam*, the English anaphoric adverb *so*, and other conventional expressions which are not used as particles.

---

[108] Plautus, *Bacchides* 200.

This is of course only one possible gradient, based on the set of properties established in Chapter 3. There may be other important properties, which are not considered here due to the small set of positive response particles on which they are based. And the properties that are included—intended as cross-linguistic—are deliberately broad in order to provide a template for similar studies in the future, in Latin and beyond. When more descriptions are available across languages, these properties can be fine-tuned. 'Utterance-peripheral position', for instance, has been defined here only in opposition to diachronically prior 'utterance-internal position' (*ita, rogo*[109] versus *ita sum*[110] or theoretically possible, but unattested in my corpus, *ita rogo*).

The aim of this chapter is to determine whether any positive response particles, such as are known from modern languages, existed in Latin and where on the gradient mentioned above the attested potential positive response would be located, that is, how many of the basic properties, as defined in Chapter 3, they share.

The assumption here is that positive response particles develop from the type of lexical material which is, due to some favourable anaphoric or deictic property, likely to occur in a positive response. Frequently, this lexical material starts its path of development as a pro-form.[111] This means that a positive response particle used to be a pro-form, which became conventionalised. Determining whether something is a positive response particle in Latin consists, to a large extent, of determining whether it is closer to a pro-form or to a particle. In the following sections, I attempt to do this for *ita*, *sic*, *fiat*, *licet*, by studying their forms, antecedents, and position in utterance. The section on *etiam* stands apart; due to the small number of attestations, it is not possible to study *etiam* according to the same parameters, so the discussion is largely qualitative.

5.2 Analysis of non-echo responses in Plautus and Terence

In Chapter 3, the basic properties of the non-echo responses were established based on a small set of modern languages. Each of them was linked to a heuristic which should help to find out to what extent the properties hold for the non-echo responses in Latin. Studying forms, together with their frequency, should reveal whether non-echo responses were formally fixed, as in modern languages. Studying antecedents should reveal, together with the use of intensification

---

[109] Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1026.
[110] Plautus, *Persa* 284, see example (2) of this chapter.
[111] But not only, see sections 5.2.3–5.2.5.

strategies, whether they were neutral or inherently emphatic and whether they provided nothing more nor less than polarity. Studying their position in an utterance should reveal whether they were used utterance-peripherally, as in modern languages, and whether they co-occurred with other positive response strategies. The ultimate goal is to compare the non-echo responses in Latin to the positive response particles in other languages, and to establish pragmatic trends which govern their use in Latin.

5.2.1 Ita

Ita is an anaphoric adverb, an equivalent of *thus* or *so*, which is sometimes considered the closest candidate for the positive response particle in Latin. The problem (and the paradox associated with all non-echo responses in our corpus), is that due to the very properties which allowed *ita* to be used as a positive response strategy, it is still likely to be used in its primary, function of the anaphoric adverb. Before studying it based on the criteria developed in Section 3.2.2 of Chapter 3 and assessing where on the gradient mentioned above *ita* was located, it will be useful to establish the endpoint of its development as a positive response.

In cases like (1), *ita* is used as part of a positive response, but still in its primary function.

(1) *Sagaristio: video ego te: iam incubitatus es.*
Paegnium: **ita sum***. [...]*
'I can see you: you've already been covered like an egg.—I have. […]' (Plautus, *Persa* 284)

The exchange features two slaves in a vulgar shouting match. The antecedent is Sagaristio's statement that Paegnium had already been subjected to a sexual act in a passive position. Paegnium's response can be considered a modified sentence answer, where the whole verbal group is echoed, with *incubitatus* substituted by *ita*. In terms of the basic properties of positive response particles, it can be observed that it is located inside the phrase (not utterance-peripherally). It is thus not likely to be confused with a positive response particle.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, we have the following examples.

(2)　　　　*Aenigmata loquor?* **Ita plane***, donec distinctius quod sentio enuntiem.*
'I speak in riddles, you protest; so I do, until I make my meaning clear.' (Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae* 7.13.1)

In an example of diaphony (see Section 2.2 in Chapter 2), Pliny the Younger uses *ita* to respond to his own question. In this case, *ita* has clearly become a positive response particle, since it occurs at the periphery of the utterance and the sentence position is not expressed.

(3)   *Cum haec diceret, ad aurem eius Psyche ridens accessit, et cum dixisset nescioquid, "**ita**, **ita**" inquit Quartilla, "bene admonuisti. Cur non, quia bellissima occasio est, devirginatur Pannychis nostra?"*

'As she said this, a smiling Psyche approached and whispered something in her ear. "Yes, yes," Quartilla said, "you did well to remind me. This is the perfect moment for it, so why shouldn't our Pannychis surrender her virginity?' (Petronius, *Satyrica* 25.1–2)

In this example from Petronius, the antecedent is not explicit, but it is likely that it was a suggestion that Pannychis should lose her virginity. It is located at the periphery of the utterance. No emphasis is expected here and the absence thereof is arguably suggested by reduplication as well (another frequent feature of modern positive response particles, not considered here due to the lack of attestation). Most importantly, as will be discussed below, in Plautus and Terence, *ita* is mostly[112] limited to responses to information antecedents, so the fact that here it confirms a future action, implies applicability to a wider range of contexts.

These two examples suggest that *ita* underwent a significant development from the state reflected in our corpus.

5.2.1.1   Forms

This section studies formal properties of *ita*-responses based on the categories established in Section 3.2.2 of Chapter 3. Proceeding from the overview of forms in both authors, I analyse examples of each category and, in addition to the goal stated above, I attempt to identify pragmatic reasons for the choice of an *ita*-response in a given context.

Table 5.2.1a shows all formal realisations of *ita*-responses in Plautus and Terence. It is followed by a commentary of each category.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Bare ita	15	10 [32]

---

[112] But see exceptions in (18), (19), and (20) below.

Ita est	9	3 [9.6]
Ita + verb	15	11 [35.2]
Ita + intensifier	11	1 [3.2]
Longer construction	17	5 [16]

Table 5.2.1a

5.2.1.1.1 Bare *ita*

The following is a typical use of the bare *ita* in the corpus.

(4)   *Hegio: ut vos hic, itidem illic apud vos meus servatur filius.*
        Philocrates: captus est?
        Hegio: **ita***.*
         'My son's being held prisoner there at your place, just as you are here.—Has
        he been captured?—Yes.' (Plautus, *Captivi* 261–2)

The conversation is between the old man Hegio and his prisoner Philocrates. Hegio informs Philocrates that his son is also a prisoner. Philocrates, inferring that he must have been captured in battle, wishes to have his inference confirmed by a polar question. Hegio confirms the inference by uttering a bare *ita*, which is also the only word in the response. This example can be considered an initial piece of evidence that *ita* was used as a positive response particle at the time of Plautus.

Plautus has 15 and Terence 10 [32] bare occurrences. This development in Terence could represent a record of gradual formal fixation of *ita* as a positive response particle.

5.2.1.1.2 *Ita est*

I consider bare *ita* and *ita est* semantically equivalent. Speaker 1, by uttering a polar question, presents a state of affairs where they are missing a polarity, that is, they present two disjunctive states (either 'is true that X' or 'it not true that X'; see Holmberg 2016: 13); the way for Speaker 2 to choose the one that applies is either to echo it in its entirety (echo response) or to

perform various levels of substitution and ellipsis. Suppose a few possible (invented) responses to the example (4) above:[113]

(5)   *Philocrates: captus est?*
        Hegio₁: captus est.
        Hegio₂: ita est.
        *Hegio₃: **ita**.*

The first response is the full echo response. In the second one, the predicate adjective *captus* is substituted by an anaphoric adverb *ita* (echo + substitution). In the third response—the attested one—an additional operation is realised, that is the omission of *est* (echo + substitution + ellipsis). The ellipsis of *esse* is a frequent phenomenon, not limited to positive responses; for our purposes, it will suffice to say that for reasons of communicative economy (ease of production and processing?), it can be omitted. The ellipsis of *est* does not affect the truth value of the response. Considered from the other side, even when omitted, *est* must always be presupposed, which means that *ita* must be semantically equivalent to *ita est*.

In this sense, *ita est* is anterior to *ita*. However, it should be kept in mind that this anteriority applies to cognitive processing, rather than real time, where the community of speakers would first use *ita est* and then gradually start omitting it. The latter scenario is neither impossible nor improbable, but is not an obvious conclusion and certainly not one made here. Since the discussion above concerns cognitive processing, the switch *est expressed > est omitted* happens inside the speaker's mind and the *expressed est*-stage is not necessarily historically attested.[114] In other words, the fact that both stages, *ita est* and *ita*, are actually attested in Roman comedy, is intriguing, but, as we will see, it depends on pragmatic factors. The takeaway here is that this fact does not suffice to form conclusions in terms of diachronic change between Plautus' and Terence's time. It is, for instance, interesting that while the ratio *ita est* vs. *ita* in Terence significantly changes in favour of *ita* (thus supporting the idea of language change), the absolute share of *ita est* remains the same in both authors.

---

[113] In communicative reality, as we have seen many times, pragmatic restrictions apply, which may make some of these responses infelicitous. However, since I adduce them to illustrate the semantics of the response, these do not concern us here.

[114] The same idea was expressed in Potočnik (2023: 86–7) in discussing the relationship between the echo response and the positive response particles.

5.2.1.1.3 *Ita + verb*

This category includes cases where *ita* occurs with lexical verbs as well as *esse* in persons other than the 3rd person singular (e.g., *ita sum* in (2) above). While in the previous two categories, *ita* can be said to carry no more than the meaning of polarity, in *ita + verb* constructions it occurs in its primary function of an anaphoric adverb, in a response which carries more than polarity, as will be shown below. The function of *ita* in such a response is to substitute for a part of the antecedent. A such, it does not occur as a positive response particle; however, due to its significant presence among positive responses, this category deserves a closer look.

> (6)   *Apoecides: [...] illic me autem sic assimulabam: quasi stolidum, combardum me faciebam.*
> *Periplectomenus: **immo ita decet**.*
> 'But I pretended to be stupid and daft there.— Yes, that's appropriate.'
> (Plautus, *Epidicus* 420–422)

In (6), the antecedent is a statement which recounts Speaker 1's course of action in the past. The illocutionary intent of Speaker 2's response is to express approval, which is evident from the verb *decet* 'it is appropriate'. *Ita* substitutes for *quasi stolidum, combardum me faciebam*.

While in the previous case, *ita* is a real substitute, in (7) below its function is less clear.

> (7)   *Phaedromus: sequere hac, Palinure, me ad fores, fi mi opsequens.*
> *Palinurus: **ita faciam**.*
> 'Palinurus, follow me this way to the door, be obedient to me.—Yes, I will.'
> (Plautus, *Curculio* 87)

Phaedromus orders Palinurus to follow him, to which Palinurus responds with *ita faciam*. However, in this case, the pro-form *faciam*—functionally equivalent to the echo response—is a sufficient substitute for the focal element (*sequere*), as is evident from the several cases where *faciam* occurs without *ita*.[115] Semantically speaking, this makes *ita* redundant. Thesleff (1960: 24) treats such cases as idiomatic expressions.

The question is, why Speaker 2 chose *ita faciam* over *faciam*. Palinurus, who is in a good relationship with his master and wants to keep it that way, might have chosen a longer formulation in order to express a greater degree of deference. In natural conversation, a one-

---

[115] E.g., Plautus, *Curculio* 88, *Trinummus* 235; Terence, *Andria* 46.

139

word positive response seems to be an unusual occurrence, possibly because it might be seen as dismissive and thus uncooperative. It is thus possible that Phaedromus would have understood a minimal, one-word agreement as impolite and disrespectful, arising out of Palinurus' acceptance of the social order in place, rather than his actual willingness to comply with the directive—a grudging agreement, that is. By avoiding a minimal response, Palinurus might have wanted to prevent such interpretation by Phaedromus. Supporting this idea is the fact that *ita faciam* could have been felt as a shorter version of *ita ut iubes facam*—an overtly submissive and cooperative response, typical for lower characters or those with less power in a given conversation.[116] It is of course an open question whether this particular idiom was limited to the theatre-speak of the Roman comedy, but the choice of a longer formulation over a shorter one for the sake of politeness is likely to reflect communicative reality not limited to Latin (see Risselada 2021: 720–1).

As suggested by the examples (6) and (7), the set of full verbs which occur with *ita* in positive responses in Roman comedy is diverse:

- in Plautus: *loquor*, *fiet*, *dico*, *videtur*, *faciam*, and *decet*;
- In Terence: *quaeso*, *factumst*, *aiunt*, *spero*, *praedicant*, *credo*, *videtur*, *dico*.

While they can all felicitously occur in a positive response, they stand at different distances from the prototypical positive response strategy which provides no more than polarity. Thus, *decet*, a lexical verb, is the most distant and belongs to the category 'other' as defined in Section 2.4 of Chapter 2. The pro-verb *faciam*, an auxiliary verb which obtains meaning only in reference to the antecedent, is closer to the prototype, since semantically it seems to provide no more than agreement (in this sense, it is the action equivalent to what is understood as positive polarity in information antecedents). However, it also carries pragmatic meanings. If the echo response can be an overt sign of obedience (see Chapter 6), and if *ita* in (7) was added as a politeness strategy, this points to the fact that the minimal *faciam* was undesirable, which suggests that speakers in Roman comedy used it deliberately—perhaps to express displeasure—and it cannot be said to carry no more than agreement.

Two other classes of verbs in positive responses deserve a mention: *verba dicendi*/*sentiendi* and hedges/evidentials. They are represented by (8) and (9) below.

---

[116] E.g., Amphitruo's response to Jupiter in Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1144, and the devout Sostrata's response to her husband's order in Terence, *Hecyra* 612.

(8)   *Menedemus: quid dotis dicam te dixisse filio? quid obticuisti?*

        Chremes: dotis?

        Menedemus: **ita dico**.

        'How much dowry shall I tell my son you've offered? … Why the silence?—

        Dowry?—That's what I said.' (Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 937–8)

In (8), Menedemus is asking Chremes about the size of the dowry he is willing to offer for his daughter's wedding. Chremes, deep in thought, repeats in a repair what for him is the focal part of the antecedent. A repair antecedent requires an emphatic confirmation. This is provided by *ita dico*, which suggests that the construction *ita + verb* has a similar pragmatic force as as *ita + intensifier*.

(9)   *Simo: […] ain tandem, civis Glyceriumst?*

        Pamphilus: **ita praedicant**.

        'Well, are you saying Glycerium is a citizen?—So they claim.' (Terence, *Andria* 875–6)

When *verbum dicendi* is in the 3rd person instead of the 1st, it shifts the responsibility for the truth of the proposition away from the speaker, so that it is possible to talk about *hedges* (in that they enable the speaker to avoid commitment) or *evidentials* (in that they report the source of information). In this case, Simo is outraged at the idea of the courtesan Glycerium, with whom his son is spending time, being declared a citizen. Since an outright confirmation of that fact might be seen as further insolence and provocation, his son Pamphilus tries to shift the responsibility for the proposition towards a third person in order not to make his father even angrier.

In terms of difference between the two authors, Terence has twice more *ita + verb* occurrences; there is also a qualitative difference in that Terence uses verbs such as *credo* and *spero* as well as the verb *quaeso* (which later turns into a politeness particle; see Dickey 2012 and 2015). This difference again points to the qualitative difference between the comedies. While Plautus heavily relies on the use of fixed formulas, typically with an intensifier/intensifying verb (*ita inquam*, *ita dico*), appropriate for situational comedy, Terence uses a greater diversity of *verba sentiendi* in responses, which reflects the greater psychological depth of his characters and of topics treated in his comedies.

5.2.1.1.4   *Ita* + intensifier

Co-occurrence of *ita* with verbs such as *quaeso* and *inquam* offers a natural transition towards *ita* with intensifiers.

(10) *Sosia: tun domo prohibere peregre me advenientem postulas?*
Mercurius: haecin tua domust?
*Sosia: **ita inquam**.*
'Do you want to keep me away from my home, now that I've arrived from abroad?—Is this your home?—Yes, I assure you.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 362)

In (10), Sosia is trying to enter his master's estate. Mercury, dressed as Sosia and pretending to be him, is feigning surprise at the proposition that the place is Sosia's home, which he expresses with a repair. Since the repair is again negatively biased, Sosia requires an emphatic confirmation to counter it.

It was suggested in Chapter 3 that the presence of intensifiers might be a good way to gauge the inherent degree of emphasis present in a positive response strategy. If *ita* was more entrenched as a one-word positive response particle in Terence than in Plautus, one would expect an increase of intensifiers next to *ita* after repairs. That, however, is not the case. The attested reality is that Plautus has 11 cases of *ita* with intensifiers, while Terence only has one [3.2], which means that the presence of intensifiers cannot be taken as an indication of emphasis in a response strategy. The same was confirmed for the pronominal echo response: intensifiers are more likely to reflect authors' personal choices or processes of idiomatisation than any functional need.

This, in turn, means that *ita inquam* in (10) is not emphatic due to *inquam* (also because due to its frequency, the intensifier would have lost its intensifying force). However, since the antecedent is a repair, the emphasis is likely to have been present: either inherently in *ita* or it was provided by intonation or other nonverbal means.

5.2.1.1.5   Longer construction

The last category indicated in Table 5.2.1a concerns *ita* embedded in longer constructions. These are less interesting in terms of development of positive response particles and more as fixed idiomatic formulas. They consist of various combinations and variations of *ita est ut dicis* and *ita res est*. In Plautus and Terence, the material used is remarkably similar, although Plautus

displays more creativity than Terence by, e.g., varying the *verbum dicendi* (*experior ita esse ut praedicas*[117]).

5.2.1.1.6   Summary

Regarding formal fixedness—one of the main properties of a positive response particle—of *ita*-responses, I observe that most occurrences in both authors fit the description by occurring bare. However, *ita* in larger constructions is also heavily present. To answer the question whether *ita* was a positive response particle, not all of these other constructions need to be explained. *Ita + verb*, for instance, usually provides more than polarity, so it presents no competition for bare *ita*. The same goes for longer constructions. Both of these categories feature *ita* in its primary function of an anaphoric adverb. Their only relation to *ita* as a positive response particle might be that they lent support to its entrenchment in the community of speakers.

In Chapter 3 it was suggested that the presence of intensifiers might provide clues as to the internal emphasis of the positive response strategies. However, for *ita + intensifier* it was suggested that it depends on the personal style of the author (cf. intensified pronominal echoes in Section 4.3.1.4 of Chapter 4) and thus cannot be taken as a faithful indicator. Since it could be a feature of the theatre-speak of the Roman comedy, it is not possible to suggest whether it lent support to the entrenchment of *ita* in real-life communicative situations.

The only construction which presents competition to the bare *ita* is *ita est*, since it was shown that both of them, semantically speaking, provide no more than polarity. It was also suggested that *ita est* is (cognitively, not diachronically) a pre-stage of *ita*.

In terms of difference between Plautus and Terence, I note that while the frequency of bare *ita* is higher in Terence, that of *ita est* and longer constructions remains roughly the same.

5.2.1.2   Antecedents

This section studies antecedent types. Proceeding from the overview of the antecedents triggering *ita*-responses in our corpus, it discusses each antecedent type separately, attempts to identify the form of the *ita*-response which is likely to occur after an antecedent type and, where

---

[117] Plautus, *Miles gloriosus* 633.

possible, discusses cases where *ita*-responses have functions other than providing a positive response.

Table *5.2.1b* shows all types of antecedents which trigger *ita*-responses in Plautus and Terence. It is followed by a commentary of each category.

	Plautus	Terence
Polar question	10	2 [6.4]
Repair	20	10 [32]
Statement	28	14 [44.8]
Wish	1	1 [3.2]
Directive	4	1 [3.2]
Intention	2	1 [3.2]
Question on future action	1	
Other	1	

Table 5.2.1b

It is immediately clear that most occurrences of *ita* in our corpus cluster around information antecedents. Presence after action antecedents is minimal. This indicates that *ita*-responses are suitable for responding to information antecedents and not (or to a very limited degree) to action antecedents. In terms of distribution between the three information antecedents, the values in the table confirm Halliday and Hasan's observation that most positive response particles do not actually respond to questions, but to statements (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 209). Since authorial intentions, exigencies of register, and other non-linguistic factors are unlikely to influence this distribution, this suggests that, in this sense, the language of Roman comedy is naturalistic.

In terms of the divide 'information *versus* action antecedents', there is no significant difference between the two authors. If the increase of bare *ita* in Terence might suggest a fixation of bare *ita* in Terence's time, this seems not to have been accompanied by a parallel increase in its

utility across a wider range of contexts, as one might expect from the development of a positive response particle (but see examples (18)–(20) below for meaningful exceptions).

5.2.1.2.1 Polar question

In response to polar questions, *ita*-responses occur 10 times in Plautus and 2 [6.4] times in Terence. They are formally diverse, as shown by Table 5.2.1c below.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Bare ita	1	
Ita est	1	
Ita + verb		1 [3.2]
Ita + intensifier	4	1 [3.2]
Longer construction	4	

Table 5.2.1c

No correlation can be observed between the polar question antecedent and any particular formal realisation. I note, however, that in Plautus, bare occurrences and *ita est* are in minority (one occurrence after both types) compared to longer and intensified formulations (4 occurrences after both types). Terence only has 2 [6.4], neither of which are bare *ita* or *ita est*, which might be a reflection of the same state of affairs.

As shown by Armstrong (2008), Speaker 1's belief plays a role in the choice of a positive response strategy (see Section 3.2.1 of Chapter 3). In polar questions, belief can be neutral, positive, or negative. If a positive response strategy triggered by a repair antecedent may be considered inherently emphatic, then those triggered by antecedents characterised by positive and neutral belief might be considered inherently neutral. Let us examine the belief in (4) above, repeated here as (11):

(11)   *Hegio: ut vos hic, itidem illic apud uos meus seruatur filius.*
         Philocrates: captus est?
         Hegio: **ita**.
          'My son's being held prisoner there at your place, just as you are here.—Has he been captured?—Yes.' (Plautus, *Captivi* 261–2)

Hegio tells his prisoner Philocrates that his son is a prisoner as well, just like Philocrates and Tyndarus are at Hegio's. Since being prisoner is usually the consequence of being captured, Hegio's statement serves as evidence for Philocrates' inference that the son was captured. Due to the presence of an inference, we may consider this a positively biased question: upon uttering the question, Philocrates had already formed a positive belief that the proposition *the son was captured* is true. I assume that positively biased antecedents tend to be responded to by neutral positive response strategies, which might suggest that *ita* was neutral. However, the significant presence of *ita* after repairs, as we will see below, suggests otherwise.

Out of 10 occurrences in Plautus, two are negatively biased, the rest have either a neutral or a positive bias. Both negatively biased occurrences are followed by longer formulations. In Terence both occurrences are positively biased and followed by *ita* + intensifier and *ita* + verb.

In Section 4.3.2, I studied the pairs *polar question—echo response* in terms of information being exchanged. Based on this I divided the exchanges into content-oriented and procedural. In content-oriented exchanges, Speaker 1 is genuinely interested in acquiring a piece of information, as in (11) above. In procedural exchanges, the motivation for asking a polar question is different (greeting, introducing a topic into the conversation, etc.). I then attempted to quantify this by observing the followed parameters in the corpus:

- Information concluded before the time of speaking > the main verb in past tense;
- Information not concluded before the time of speaking > the main verb in non-past tense;
- Co-interactants are involved > main verb in the 1st or the 2nd person;
- Co-interactants are not involved > main verb in the 3rd person.

Based on the results obtained, I concluded that the echo response is more likely to occur in procedural and less likely in content-oriented exchanges, that is, a polar question of the type 'do you…' is more likely to receive an echo response than a polar question of the type 'is it true that…' I have analysed the subset of polar questions triggering the *ita*-repsonse (10 and 2 [6.4] tokens in Plautus and Terence, respectively).

Plautus	Terence

	1st or 2nd person	3rd person	Non-past tense	Past tense	1st or 2nd person	3rd person	Non-past	Past
Form of verb in polar question	5	5	7	3		2		2

Table 5.2.1d

In Plautus, out of 10 polar questions, 5 of them have the verb in the 1st or the 2nd person and 5 in the 3rd person; 7 have the verb in tenses other than past and three have the verb in the past tense. In Terence, both polar questions have the verb in the 3rd person, both in the past tense (there are no occurrences with the verb in the 1st or the 2nd person or in the non-past tense).

Table 5.2.1da shows how the 1st/2nd vs. 3rd person split correlates with the tenses.

	Plautus		Terence	
	Non-past tense	*Past tense*	*Non-past tense*	*Past tense*
1st or 2nd person	3	2		
3rd person	4	1	2	2

Table 5.2.1da

The subset is too small, especially in the Terentian part of the corpus, to be able to make significant generalisations, as it was possible for the echo response subset, so proceeding strictly from the parameters observed here, I do not find that *ita*-responses are more likely to confirm typical, concluded information. However, as observed in the discussion on the echo response, the two parameters might not encompass all relevant occurrences; it is possible to find exchanges concerning typical information in utterances where the main verb is in the 1st or the 2nd person, for instance (but not only) in complex sentences.

(12)   *Messenio: quid ais tu? Menaechmum, opinor, te vocari dixeras.*
         Menaechmus: **ita** *vero.*
         'What do you say? I think you said you're called Menaechmus.—Yes, indeed.'
         (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1095–6)

In (12), Messenio embeds his polar question into an affirmative statement, which results in its being placed into the 'verb in the 1st or the 2nd person' category. The information he is seeking,

however, verges toward typical, since Menaechmus issued it in the past and it is concluded before the time of speaking. This is one of the two such occurrences out of 5 in the category 'verb in the 1st or the 2nd person'. This would technically change the numbers into three versus 7 in favour of content-oriented questions, which is potentially supported by the same tendency in Terence. However, due to the small size of the subset, no such conclusion is made here.

Such occurrences illustrate the tension between the need for simplicity of analytic parameters and the need for these parameters to encompass all or most relevant occurrences in the corpus. While tying hypotheses strictly to features, attested in the corpus, proves less than effective in small sets, I would argue that, since beliefs, illocutionary intentions, and other notions are in the mind of the speaker, this is a necessary evil for claims in historical pragmatics to have scientific value.

5.2.1.2.2   Repair

While in the previous category, I observed no important correlations between the antecedent type and one specific form of *ita*-response, the corelation between the repair antecedent and the form is immediately observable in both authors.

	Plautus	**Terence**
Bare *ita*	10	7 [67.2]
Ita est		1 [3.2]
Ita + verb	8	2 [6.4]
Ita + intensifier	2	
Longer construction		

Table 5.2.1e

In Plautus, repairs are followed 10 times by bare *ita*, 8 times by *ita* + verb, and twice by *ita* + intensifier. In Terence, they are followed 7 [67.2] times by bare *ita*, once [3.2 times] by *ita est* and twice [6.4 times] by *ita* + verb. Based on these values, the following observations can be made:

- There is a clear correlation between bare *ita* and the repair antecedent in both authors;

- In Plautus, there is, additionally, a correlation between *ita* + verb and the repair antecedent.

In line with the findings on positive response strategies in Brazilian Portuguese and Finnish and with the lack of bare *ita* after polar questions, the first observation suggests that *ita* as a positive response particle was inherently emphatic. The same state of affairs in both authors strengthens this interpretation.

About the second observation one may ask whether it undermines the emphatic interpretation or strengthens it. Since *ita* + verb, as suggested above, is often a positive response strategy with more pragmatic force than bare *ita*, this might suggest that bare *ita* was not so emphatic after all or at least put in question the validity of the previous observation for Plautus. However, I suggest that that is not the case and that the heavy presence of these constructions is idiomatically, rather than functionally motivated. Take the following example:

(13)   *Harpax: [...] hoc tibi erus me iussit ferre Polymachaeroplagides, quod deberet, atque ut mecum mitteres Phoenicium.*
Ballio: erus tuos?
*Harpax: ita **dico.***
Ballio: miles?
Harpax: ita loquor.
Ballio: Macedonius?
*Harpax: admodum, **inquam**.*
'My master Polymachaeroplagides told me to bring you this, his debt, and you were to send Phoenicium with me.—Your master?—That's what I'm saying.—The soldier?—That's what I'm stating.—From Macedonia?—Yes, I say.'
(Plautus, *Pseudolus* 1150–3)

This is a frequent pattern, where Speaker 1 rapidly issues a series of antecedents and Speaker 2 issues a series of responses, functionally equivalent, but formally deliberately varied. On the one hand, this means that the statistic of 8 should be taken with reservation, since it is partly literary motivated. On the other hand, since all antecedents are repairs, and all responses to them must be emphatic, this example provides strong evidence that *ita dico* and *ita loquor* are functionally equivalent to the third positive response *admodum, inquam*. Now, *admodum* is itself certainly emphatic (except for a possible, but not observable erosion of emphasis), which means that *inquam*'s emphatic contribution to the response is minimal. *Inquam*, in addition, is,

just like *dico* and *loquor*, originally a *verbum dicendi*, which became or was on the way to becoming an intensifying particle, which is further evidence that the emphatic contribution of *dico* and *loquor* is comparable to the contribution of any intensifying strategy, such as *hercle*, *pol*, or *inquam*.

Since the *ita* + verb and *ita* + intensifier provide no more emphasis than bare *ita*, and since the token value of *ita* + verb in Terence is much lower, I conclude that the use of *ita* + verb is a specifically Plautine phenomenon, motivated by idiomatic choices of the author, rather than functional considerations (cf. the same conclusion for intensified pronominal echo in Chapter 4). Secondly, the values for *ita*-responses after repair antecedents indicate that when *ita* was used in a particle-like way, it was inherently empathic. The fact that other inherently emphatic positive responses, such as *ita* + verb and *ita* + intensifier existed in parallel, does not preclude that conclusion.

Still, co-existence of *ita* with *ita + verb* might not have been without consequence. Panchon (1995) suggests that the 'intensifying' value of *ita* (in general) was the result of cross-contamination with *sic*. If that is the case, then the cross-contamination between *ita* and *ita* + verb seems even more likely. In this scenario, the intensifying effect of *ita dico* might have encouraged the emphatic understanding of *ita* in responses—the latter could, in the minds of the community of Latin speakers, as easily be understood as an elided version of *ita dico* as that of *ita est* (cf. *ita faciam* versus *ita ut iubes faciam* in Section 5.2.1.1.3). Quite apart from the semantic difference between *ita dico* and *ita (est)*, then, the idiomatic character of these responses, suggested by Thesleff (1960), might have played an important role in choosing positive response strategies.

Another noteworthy feature of *ita* following a repair in our corpus is a high frequency of responses where *ita* is not only bare, but also the only word in a response. It was suggested in Section 5.2.1.1.3, that minimal responses can, in unmarked circumstances, be associated with uncooperativeness and impoliteness. This would mean that these positive responses triggered by repairs would be considered uncooperative (5 occurrences of *ita* in Plautus and 6 in Terence). I suggest, however, that the high frequency of minimal responses might be explained by the fact that following a repair, a salient response is expected. While this is achieved in part by inherent emphasis, the minimal response strengthens the pragmatic force of the response (by virtue of its unexpectedness) and, additionally, gives the utterer of the repair more time to

process the information. They would thus be more likely to excuse the apparent uncooperativeness.

The position taken in this study is that repair antecedents carry negative belief by default. This was established in Section 3.2.1 of Chapter 3 based on such studies as Armstrong (2008) and Sorjonen (2001). The same finding from such genetically distant languages as Brazilian Portuguese and Finnish suggests that this assumption is cross-culturally valid, so unless plausible evidence to the contrary should be found, it must be valid for Latin as well. In my close reading of the corpus, I have not found any evidence to the contrary. In the corpus, repairs are very well attested, so conclusions about the belief in repairs and the pragmatic force of responses triggered by them have statistical support. However, despite the assumption of inherent negative belief, it is worth briefly discussing overt markers of belief in repairs, to see whether all cases should trigger an emphatic response. Take the following example from Terence's *Adelphoe*.

(14)   *Demea: ubi illum inveniam cogito.*

Syrus: scio ubi sit, verum hodie numquam monstrabo.

Demea: **hem!** *quid ais?*

Syrus: ita.

'I'm wondering where I can find him.—I know where he is, but I'm not going to tell you.—Oh! What are you saying?—You heard.' (Terence, *Adelphoe* 569–570)

Demea is looking for his brother Micio. Syrus, Micio's slave, in an open act of defiance, announces that he knows, but will not tell him. The act of defiance is surprising to Demea, which he expresses by a repair. A surprise implies negative belief. In this case, this belief is overtly expressed by *hem!*, an expression of surprise, attested in both authors.[118] Other overt markers of negative belief in repairs include, among others, *quid*,[119] and *obsecro*.[120]

Rarely, one encounters markers of positive belief in repairs, such as in the following example.

(15)   *Trachalio: st! tace, ausculta modo. ait venisse illum in somnis ad se mortuom.*

Theopropides: **nempe** *ergo in somnis?*

---

[118] E.g., Plautus, *Asinaria* 445, *Aulularia* 811; Terence, *Adelphoe* 468 and the example (14) (although it seems that the functions of *hem* are more varied in Terence).
[119] E.g., Plautus, *Bacchides* 147, *Bacchides* 317; Terence, *Adelphoe* 700.
[120] E.g., Plautus, *Mercator* 888.

Trachalio: ita. sed ausculta modo [...].

'Hush! Be quiet, just listen. He said that that dead man had come to him in his sleep.—It was in his sleep then?—Yes. But just listen.' (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 490–492)

The slave Trachalio is explaining to Theopropides that his son told him that a dead man had come to him in his sleep. Theopropides, surprised, issues a question, realised by echo, but preceded by *nempe* and *ergo*. Based on the common understanding of *nempe* as a signal of certainty[121] as well as the interactional understanding of *nempe* as a call upon Speaker 1 to reaffirm their commitment to their statement (Schricx 2011: 75), *nempe* in this case is a marker of positive belief regarding a proposition, something like 'you obviously mean in his sleep?' So even though the utterance is still a repair, in this case, the emphatic response by Trachalio is pragmatically not necessary. However, since this is the only case of positive belief in a repair which I was able to identify in our corpus, the correlation between negative belief in repairs and an emphatic *ita*-responses still stands.

5.2.1.2.3 Statement

As established in Section 3.4.1 of Chapter 3 and Section 4.2.2 of Chapter 4, statement antecedents reveal quite different types of information about positive response strategies than polar question and repair, and importantly, they do not invite a response or designate the next holder of the floor. The two most important functions are turn-taking and providing linguistic feedback.

Based on what was said about *ita* above, one expects bare *ita*—the candidate for a positive response particle—to be unlikely to function as a feedback strategy. As an inherently emphatic particle, it should have too much pragmatic force to be used as a barely noticeable, phonologically inconspicuous, non-intrusive expression, such as a feedback strategy is expected to be. On the other hand, it is especially due to its pragmatic force that one expects it to function well as a turn-taking strategy. Its inherent emphasis implies a degree of enthusiasm and this alone effectively introduces new semantic content into the conversation. The new content by another speaker can, first of all, only be introduced in a new turn, and second, the enthusiasm carried by *ita* is an efficient signal to the co-interactant that a new idea is incoming.

---

[121] The Oxford Latin Dictionary has the following: '(justifying a remark or attitude by a statement which it is assumed the other speaker will not contradict) Without doubt, of course, to be sure' '(introducing a question framed in the form of an expected answer) So it may be assumed that…?' (Glare 1968).

Nevertheless, based on the data of my corpus, just like the echo response, *ita*-responses participate in both of these functions. Before discussing occurrences of both functions, let us examine what forms of *ita*-responses statement antecedents trigger.

	Plautus	Terence
Bare *ita*	2	2 [6.4]
Ita est	8	2 [6.4]
Ita + verb	3	5 [16]
Ita + intensifier	4	
Longer construction	11	5 [16]

Table 5.2.1f

In Plautus, statement antecedents are most frequently followed by longer constructions and *ita est*. In Terence, they are most frequently followed by longer constructions and *ita* + verb constructions. Another noteworthy feature of this data is that bare *ita* very rarely occurs as a response to a statement. This suggests the following observations:

- After statements, longer *ita*-responses are preferred;
- Bare *ita*—potential positive response particle—rarely occurs as a response to a statement.

Regarding the first observation, it was hypothesised that longer responses tend to be perceived as politer than short responses, because a minimal response might be regarded as brusque in general or as a grudging positive response by a person of a socially lower rank—something which would not be in a slave's best interest.

If the idea of the length of a positive response strategy holds, it is necessary to explain the high presence of the response *ita est*, which is not all that long. A comparison with (7) in Section 5.2.1.1.3 should be helpful. It was argued that *ita faciam* is a politer response than *faciam*. It was then suggested that *ita faciam* might be a shorter version of such responses as *ita ut iubes faciam*. In the same way, *ita est* could be seen as a shorter version of *ita est ut dicis* or similar. If this theory holds, then the distinction in this matter is, rather than 'shorter response versus longer response', better envisaged as 'minimal response versus non-minimal response'.

Minimal responses would then be bare *ita* (after information antecedents) or *faciam* (after action antecedents); non-minimal responses would be every other *ita*-response, such as *ita (est) ut dicis* (after information antecedents) and *ita faciam* or *ita it iubes faciam* (after action antecedents).

This offers an insight regarding the relationship between individual positive response strategies and about explanatory powers of different approaches. In Section 5.2.1.1.2, *ita est* was discussed as being semantically close to *ita*. However, above, it was suggested that in terms of language usage, *ita est* is actually closer to longer *ita*-responses. Seconly, while *ita + verb* constructions are often functionally motivated (as in non-categorical responses, especially in Terence's more complex characters), they are as often motivated by sociolinguistic and idiomatic reasons. This, first of all, demonstrates the pre-eminence of the pragmatic approaches over semantic ones: as necessary and convincing as insights into deep semantic structures are in abstract terms, semantic models, as observed by Hansen (2020), fall apart in the face of attested usage. Secondly, it speaks for data-based approaches in pragmatics, as advocated by Levinson (1983) and Halliday (1984), among others.

It was established above that longer responses are preferred after statements. However, since we are specifically interested in *ita* as a potential positive response particle, we should also turn to the second observation, that is, that bare *ita* is rarely triggered by statements. In the following, I discuss a few cases, where bare *ita* is nevertheless triggered by a statement, to see, first of all, why they go against the trend and whether specific pragmatic conditions can be identified; and, secondly, whether these occurrences can be identified as turn-taking strategies.

The following example offers two moves, where *ita* is triggered by a statement.

> (16)　　*Amphitruo: Sosia.*
> 　　　　*Mercurius: **ita**: sum Sosia, nisi me esse oblitum existumas. quid nunc vis?*
> 　　　　*Amphitruo: sceleste, at etiam quid velim, id tu me rogas?*
> 　　　　*Mercurius: **ita**, rogo. paene effregisti, fatue, foribus cardines.*
> 　　　　'Sosia!—Yes, I am Sosia, unless you think I've forgotten. What do you want now?—You criminal, you're even asking me what I want?—Yes, I am asking. You almost broke the hinges off the doors, you thickhead.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1025–6)

Amphitruo, who has just received a threat from his slave Sosia (not knowing that it is actually Mercury, disguised as Sosia), calls his name out in surprise. Mercury confirms that he is indeed Sosia—who should get into considerable trouble for this type of behaviour toward his master.

This move is salient in two ways. In terms of the usual turn-taking, Amphitruo's move, which is an expression of surprise, does not create a sequential implication according to which the next move is likely to be interpreted as a response (see Sorjonen 2001: 33). However, Mercury, in order to get the real Sosia in trouble, makes sure to interpret it as a statement of fact (or rather, he picks out the statement of fact element of the utterance) and provides a positive response to it. The second way in which this move is salient is the fact that it was made at all— a slave does not even have the right to the conversational floor (Berger 2020b), let alone to challenge his master like this.

It is thus reinterpreting the illocutionary intent of the antecedent as a statement which allows Mercury to confirm that he is Sosia by using *ita*. The fact that he does not stop there, but keeps holding the floor is evidence that *ita* is a turn-taking strategy. The subsequent content of the turn, *sum Sosia*, is an additional confirmation, perhaps to really make sure that Sosia lands in trouble. *Ita*, just like other positive response strategies in this role (see Section 4.3.2 in Chapter 4), can be seen as a bait-and-switch. Both co-interactants (as well as all members of the language community), know that *ita* is a type of confirmation which is easy to slip into the conversation, seemingly just to confirm, but really to gain the floor and hold it for as long as needed. Mercury certainly makes the most of it and further challenges Amphitruo's authority by asking *quid nunc vis?*, to which the shocked Amphitruo issues a repair. Mercury then responds with another bare *ita*, a common occurrence after a repair (since the turn was given to him, we cannot see the second *ita* as a turn-taking strategy).

Another piece of evidence for *ita* as a turn-taking strategy is provided by Terence in the following example (also discussed in Potočnik 2023: 84).

(17)   *Geta: Quid agitur? Multa advenienti, ut fit, nova hic?*
       Chremes: Compluria.
       Geta: **Ita**. *De Antiphone audistin quae facta?*
       'How are you doing? See many changes on your return, as usual?—Quite a lot.—Indeed. Have you heard what's happened to Antipho?' (Terence, *Phormio* 611–2)

Geta starts a conversation with the old man Chremes upon his return from travelling. As an initiating turn, Geta asks him whether much has changed since he left, to which Chremes responds that many things have changed. To this statement, Geta responds with *ita*. Since *ita* is a positive response to the previous statement, it allows him to get the word in edgewise and proceed with the question he really wanted to ask. Since Geta is confirming information which he himself was seeking to obtain a moment ago, the positive response may seem out of place. However, the remainder of the move—the evidence of the 'new things' in question—shows that Geta has a good reason to confirm the statement. So rather than *ita* being out of place, it is technically the initiating question which is somewhat insincere (since Geta has evidence that some 'new things' have happened). However, since it becomes obvious to both interactants that Geta had evidence and was not trying to hide it, the question functions as an acceptable conversation starter and does not cause any loss of conversational cohesion.

Three out of four occurrences of bare *ita* triggered by a statement in my corpus—one out of two in Plautus and both in Terence—can be shown to function as turn-taking strategies (the remaining occurrence in Plautus fits the emphatic interpretation[122]). As suspected above, the emphatic character of *ita* is very compatible with this use. In (16), Mercury tries emphatically to make sure that Sosia's name be associated with his own unacceptable behaviour. In (17), the emphatic *ita* is explained by the fact that Geta knows that a lot has happened in the old man's absence, since he has evidence of his own to that effect and he is he eager to share it with him.

5.2.1.2.4 Directive

Plautus has 5 *ita*-responses triggered by directives and Terence has one. All of them are realised by *ita* + verb constructions, in which, as discussed in Section 5.2.1.1.3, *ita* is used in its primary function of anaphoric adverb. As such, these responses are not interesting for studying *ita* as positive response strategy, but are more interesting for studying pro-form verbs, such as *facio*, which are not the subject of this study. As was suggested in Section 5.2.1.1.3, seemingly unnecessary occurrences of *ita* beside verbs can sometimes be explained by pragmatic reasons, such as avoiding a potentially face-threatening minimal response.

The absence of *ita* as an independent positive response strategy after directives (which are some of the most frequent speech acts in our corpus) suggest a very rigid constraint on the use of *ita*,

---

[122] Plautus, *Miles gloriosus* 1261–2.

namely, that it can only be used to confirms past, concluded states of affairs. Since a future action is a potential and future state of affairs, it cannot be agreed to by *ita*.

Wish. Each author has one *ita*-response triggered by an expression of wish. In Terence, the construction used is again *ita* + verb (*ita fiat*[123]), while Plautus has *ita* + *intensifier*:

(18)   *Lysidamus: quod bonum atque fortunatum mihi sit!*

*Olympio: **ita vero**, et mihi.*

'May this turn out well and luckily for me!—Yes, and for me.' (Plautus, *Casina* 402)

Just before the drawing of the lots, which are supposed to decide whether his slave Olympio will marry the slave-girl Casina, thus granting him access to the girl, Lysidamus wishes himself luck. His slave Olympio, who is probably counting on benefitting from the arrangement as well, agrees with *ita vero*. Intuitively, this feels natural (presumably due to our own expectations regarding positive response particles), but is highly unusual for our corpus: in an overwhelming majority of cases, *ita* as an independent positive response strategy is used to confirm information antecedents and almost never future antecedents, as in this case. This occurrence thus illustrates the blurry lines between speech acts in the antecedents: the desired outcome is still a state of affairs, albeit a potential, non-concluded one.

5.2.1.2.5   Intention and Question on future action

The following examples shows two more uses of *ita* triggered by future action antecedents.

(19)   *Agorastocles: ibo et pultabo ianuam.*

*Advocati: **ita**, quippini?*

'I'll go and knock at the door.—Yes, why not?' (Plautus, *Poenulus* 740)

(20)   *Euclio: atque id si scies qui apstulerit, mihi indicabis?*

Lyconides: faciam.

Euclio: nec partem tibi ab eo quisque est indipisces nec furem excipies?

*Lyconides: **ita**.*

'And if you find out who took it away, you'll inform me?—I will.—And you won't take a share from that man, whoever he is, or give shelter to the thief?—No. (Plautus, *Aulularia* 774–6)

---

[123] Terence, *Adelphoe* 521.

The antecedents in both (19) and (20) are future action antecedents (with the former expressing commitment on the side of Speaker 1 and the latter seeking commitment on the side of Speaker 2). The expected positive responses in both cases are an echo response or an *ita* + verb construction, such as the one found in Terence (*continuo hic adero—ita quaeso*[124]). *Ita* in this context is again highly unusual and seems to be limited to these two cases.

It is tempting to see these uses as reflecting an increase in the range of contexts, compatible with a positive response particle getting entrenched in the minds of Latin speakers. Another possibility is that these are instances of colloquial usage which exceptionally found their way into the written record (the above mentioned *ita quaeso*, for instance, seems to be a politer response and thus perhaps more appropriate for the written language). Examples (19) and (20), as well as (18) above, thus draw attention to the possibility that even in the case of statistically well supported trends, the language reality is likely more complex than the written record suggests.

5.2.1.2.6 Summary

While it was found that the echo response can be used after all antecedent types, both information and action—based on which the echo response was dubbed the default positive response strategy in Latin—*ita* is mostly limited to information antecedents.

In polar question antecedents, I attempted to see whether *ita* tends to respond to procedural or content-oriented questions. While qualitative analysis points to content-orientedness (as opposed to the echo response, which tends to occur in procedural exchanges), the limited size of the subset, in my opinion, precludes any firm conclusion.

Among information antecedents, it has the strongest presence after statements. This seems to be in accordance with Halliday and Hasan's (1976: 209) observation that *yes* and *no* more often occur after statements than after polar questions. It should be noted, however, that not all occurrences of *ita*-responses are particles, such as *yes* and *no*, so the parallel is not straightforward.

In terms of conversation management, three out of four occurrences of bare *ita* triggered by polar questions—one out of two in Plautus and both in Terence—can be shown to function as turn-taking strategies.

---

[124] Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 502.

There is a very limited presence of *ita*-responses after directive and other action antecedents. This could indicate a more flexible use of *ita* in real life than in our corpus. At the same time, it reveals the fuzzy boundaries between antecedent types used in this study.

5.2.1.3   Position in utterance

This section discusses position of *ita* in the utterance. As discussed in Chapter 3, this should allow us to observe whether the potential positive response particles found in our corpus occur utterance-peripherally and whether they co-occur with other positive responses, as do positive response particles in modern languages. A high presence of utterance-peripheral occurrences would, by hypothesis, mean that the positive response particle has undergone the syntactic movement to C-domain, that is, out of its original place inside a phrase, to the complement position, having scope over the whole proposition, as illustrated in Section 3.5.1 of Chapter 3.

Table 5.2.1g presents the data for *ita*.

	Plautus	Terence
In main response	52	19 [60.8]
Alone	4	7 [22.4]
Utterance-peripherally	11	4 [12.8]

Table 5.2.1g

52 occurrences in Plautus and 19 [60.8] in Terence are found in the main part of the utterance, that is, in the [sentence] position. The particle position is left empty. The [additional] position may be filled or not:

[–particle][+sentence][±additional].

A representative example is (1) in Section 5.2.1, where *ita* is clearly an anaphoric adverb and a part of the verbal group.

In four cases in Plautus and 7 [22.4] in Terence *ita* is the only word in response, where it is not possible to determine, whether the response should be represented by

[–particle][+sentence][–additional],

where *ita* still occurs in its primary function of anaphoric adverb with the rest of the sentence answer elided; or by

[+particle][−sentence][−additional],

where a positive response particle is the only word in the utterance; except that in this case, *ita* is perceived as a positive response particle by the speaker, with the rest of the utterance unexpressed. A representative example is (4) in Section 5.2.1.1.1.

The subset which allows us to observe the behaviour of *ita* at the periphery of the utterance is relatively small, consisting of 11 occurrences in Plautus and four [12.8] in Terence. They can be represented by

[+particle][±sentence][±additional],

where the particle position is filled by *ita* as a positive response particle; the rest is either a (potentially modified) sentence answer and/or additional information. A representative example is (16) in Section 5.2.1.2.3, repeated here as (21):

(21)   *Amphitruo: Sosia.*
         Mercurius: **ita***: sum Sosia, nisi me esse oblitum existumas. quid nunc vis?*
         Amphitruo: sceleste, at etiam quid velim, id tu me rogas?
         Mercurius: **ita***, rogo. paene effregisti, fatue, foribus cardines.*
         'Sosia!—Yes, I am Sosia, unless you think I've forgotten. What do you want now?—You criminal, you're even asking me what I want?—Yes, I am asking. You almost broke the hinges off the doors, you thickhead.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1025–6)

Both occurrences in this example can be represented by

[+particle][+sentence][+additional].

Ita in both cases occurs at the beginning of the utterance, which is reminiscent of the use of modern positive response particles.

It is followed by the modified sentence answer. In the first case, the sentence answer is *sum Sosia* (because the antecedent, as imagined by Mercury, is *Sosia es*). In the second case, the sentence answer is *rogo*, echoing the main verb of the antecedent, which is the polar question *Id tu me rogas?* This is one of the rare cases where a non-echo positive response co-occurs

with another positive response strategy. Since, as discussed in Chapter 3, the sentence answer is sufficient to provide polarity, its very existence indicates that in examples like (21), *ita* is likely to have conversation management functions, for which it must have passed into the C-domain.

Both utterances also contain additional content (*nisi me...* and *paene effregisti...*, respectively).

In Plautus, four occurrences (including (21)) out of 11 co-occur with other positive response strategies: the echo response in (21) above; one with *quippini* 'why not';[125] and two with implicit positive response strategies.[126] In Terence, *ita* co-occurs with another positive response strategy only once, that is with an implicit positive response strategy.[127] Since implicit positive response strategy is a peculiarity among positive response strategies, it is worth discussing it in terms of the composition of the positive response.

(22)   *Phormio: [...] an, ut ne quid turpe civis in se admitteret propter egestatem,*
         proxumo iussast dari, ut cum uno aetatem degeret? quod tu vetas.
         Demipho: **ita**, *proxumo quidem. at nos unde? aut quam ob rem—?*
         'Doesn't it rather bid you marry her to her nearest relative, so that a citizen
         woman doesn't fall into disgrace through poverty but lives her life with a
         single husband? And this is what you're preventing.—To her nearest relative,
         that's right. But where do we come in? Why—?' (Terence, *Phormio* 415–8)

In terms of positions in the response, the response in (22) can be represented by

[+particle][−sentence][+additional],

where *ita* fills the particle position; the sentence answer is not expressed (*lex iussast dari proxumo*). By saying *proxumo quidem*, Demipho makes sure Phormio understands that the law bids him to marry her to the nearest relative, and not to anyone else. It is this additional motivation to underline, which puts *proxumo quidem* into the [additional] position, rather than the [sentence answer] position.

This is an interesting example, because an implicit positive response strategy, especially when marked by *quidem*, does not have to co-occur with a carrier of polarity (a positive response strategy or a sentence answer). The fact that it does not normally co-occur with a carrier of

---

[125] Plautus, *Poenulus* 741.
[126] Plautus, *Truculentus* 667; *Mostellaria* 972.
[127] Terence, *Phormio* 418.

polarity, is made possible by the cooperative principle: every utterance is presumed to be true, unless explicitly stated otherwise. Since the positive polarity is provided by the [additional] position alone, I assume that in this case, too, the function of *ita* is conversation management, rather than providing a positive response. For that, it must necessarily have undergone the movement to C-domain.

Even though neither of the editions consulted while drafting this chapter suggest a comma after *ita*[128] in the following example, the analysis used here shows, that one should certainly be present:

> (23) *Astaphium: quid istuc? alienun es, amabo, mi Strabax, qui non extemplo*
> *<intro> ieris?*
> *Strabax: anne oportuit?*
> *Astaphium: **ita** te quidem, qui es familiaris.*
> 'What's that? Please, are you a stranger, my dear Strabax, that you didn't come straight in?—Should I have?—Yes, of course, since you're an intimate friend.'
> (Plautus, *Truculentus* 664–7)

Ita, located in the particle position, provides the positive response. The sentence answer position is not expressed; *te quidem, qui es familiaris* is located in the [additional] position, because if provides additional information ('for you, that is, since you are a friend'). This suggests that *ita* is a separate prosodic unit.

Finally, beside bare *ita*, *ita est* seems to have undergone some conventionalisation by itself. Since we are interested in potential positive response particles and their position, in this section we consider only bare *ita*; *ita est* is, in Table 5.2.1g, considered to be utterance-internal. Nevertheless, it should be noted that *ita est* itself exhibits signs of conventionalisation and even univerbation; to whatever degree these processes have been completed, it is at least possible to say that it is treated as a unit by certain speakers. Thus, in terms of the position in utterance, I observe that *ita est* can itself occur utterance peripherally, as in the following example, which, is, additionally, written as one word.[129]

---

[128] Leo's (1895) and De Melo's (2011).

[129] However, since *ita est* and *itast* might have been pronounced the same and the different spelling might also be the result of the process of transmission, I do not make any conclusions based on their respective values in the corpus.

(24)   *Parmeno: […] nam hic quoque bonam magnamque partem ad te attulit.*
        *Thais: **itast**. sed sine me pervenire quo volo […].*
        'He too has made a handsome contribution.—That's true. But let me complete my story.' (Terence, *Eunuchus* 123–4)

In this case, *itast* is likely to serve as a device to take back the conversational floor, since Parmeno himself took it from Thais. It seems that *itast* behaves like *ita* and can as a unit occur utterance-peripherally, occupying the [particle] position:

[+particle][−sentence][+additional].

5.2.1.3.1 Summary

Even though the utterance-peripheral occurrences of *ita* are in minority, the uses discussed here are convincing enough to suggest that, by the time of Plautus and Terence, *ita* has undergone the movement to C-domain; that is, it was possible to use it at the periphery of the utterance in the same way as modern positive response particles. For the same reason, it could co-occur with other positive response strategies.

Utterance-peripheral occurrences of *ita est*/*itast* confirm that there was some competition between *ita* and *ita est*.

5.2.2 Sic

Panchon (1995) observes that *sic*, at least semantically, a deictic adverb: if *ita* can refer back to things in the text, *sic* is more appropriate for things in the physical world. Its use in positive responses in Plautus and Terence, however, is very similar to the use of *ita* in the same environment.

Reflexes of *sic* are found in most Romance languages, including in *sim*, the Brazilian Portuguese positive response particle discussed in Chapter 3. The obvious question is whether its presence in Terence represents the beginning of that development. Thesleff (1960: 75, note 2) suggests that there is no continuity between Terence and reflexes of *sic* in Romance languages and that *sic* is a later innovation. Based on the data available, I cannot make a decision in favour of either option. Our sources represent a very limited view into the reality of communication in Latin. The lack of dialogic sources in the Classical period makes any conclusion a mere speculation.

5.2.2.1 Forms

Section 5.2.2.1 studies formal properties of *sic*-responses based on the categories established in Chapter 3. Proceeding from the overview of forms in both authors, I discuss examples of each and, in addition to the goal stated above, I attempt to identify pragmatic reasons for the choice of a *sic*-response in a given context.

	Plautus	Terence
Bare *sic*		4 [12.8]
Sic est	2	13 [41.6]
Sic + verb	3	11 [35.2]
Sic + intensifier		
Longer construction		2 [6.4]

Table 5.2.2a

The most salient information in Table 5.2.2a is the difference in the number of occurrences in both authors. Plautus uses *sic* in responses only 5 times, while Terence has 30 [96] occurrences. This is significant difference which requires explanation. There are several possibilities.

The first one is that the difference reflects real-life colloquial usage. According to this explanation, in the period of Plautus' activity, *sic* just started being used in positive responses, while by the time of Terence, it spread across the language community. One objection to this is the fact that Plautine comedies continued to be performed well after the date of composition of *Casina* (184 BCE), considered the last comedy to be composed. Since comedies by both authors were performed at the same time and for significant periods, the difference between authors does not necessarily reflect the usage of two distinct periods, so it is not convincing evidence of language change.

The second possibility is that the difference in attestations reflect authorial preference, rather than difference in real-life usage. The few occurrences in Plautus indicate that *sic*-responses must have already been present to some extent in colloquial language in the time of Plautus.

According to this explanation, Plautus would be more conservative and would generally avoid the colloquial innovation, while Terence would embrace it to a larger extent.[130]

It is also important to remember than not all forms *sic*-responses are equally important indicators of a possible difference in usage. Since in bare *sic* and *sic est* constructions the semantic load of confirmation is located on *sic*, they can be considered direct evidence. In *sic* + verb construction, on the other hand, sic occurs in its primary function of deictic adverb, so it cannot be considered direct evidence. However, as discussed in Section 5.2.1.1.3 for *ita* + verb, the constructions *sic* + verb can indirectly influence the entrenchment of *sic* in positive responses, so I consider it indirect evidence. While it would be ideal to be able to observe a gradual increase in usage from the beginning towards the end of the Plautine period, due to the low token values in Plautus, this is not possible.

5.2.2.1.1 Bare

There are no cases of bare *sic* in Plautus, while Terence has four [12.8]. In the following example, the use of *sic* seems no different from comparable occurrences of *ita*:

(25)   *Demipho: illa maneat?*

Chremes: **sic**.

'And the other one stays?—Yes.' (Terence, *Phormio* 813)

It serves to remind that however low the token value, it does indicate a certain degree of presence in the language. The existence of this form is enough to hypothesise that *sic* was used as a positive response particle in the period reflected by *Phormio*.

5.2.2.1.2 *Sic est*

Plautus has two cases of *sic est*. In Terence, it has gained traction with 13 [41.6] cases, which is more than *ita est* [9.6]; this suggests gradual replacement. As the following example shows, *sic est* is comparable to *ita est*, but also to *ita*:

(26)   *Micio: is venit ut secum avehat. nam habitat Mileti.*

Aeschinus: hem! virginem ut secum avehat?

Micio: **sic est**.

---

[130] As opposed to accepting it completely; as indicated by Potočnik (2023: 74, Tables 3 and 4), *sic* still has a long way to go before superseding *ita* as a positive response strategy.

Aeschinus: Miletum usque, obsecro?

Micio: **ita.**

'He's come to take her away with him. He lives at Miletus.—What! Take the girl away with him?—That's right.—All the way to Miletus, for goodness' sake?—Yes.' Terence, *Adelphoe* 653–5)

Micio and Aeschinus are discussing a soldier from Miletus, who, as the closest living relative, must marry Aeschinus' love interest. When Micio tells Aeschinus that, the latter is shocked, which he expresses with a repair. The repair is likely to receive an emphatic confirmation, which indicates that *sic est* is inherently emphatic. This is comparable to the state of affairs of *ita* in Plautus, which was more emphatic than *ita* in Terence seems to have been. After that, Aeschinus, who still cannot believe his ears, issues another repair, to which Micio responds with *ita*. This indicates that *sic est* and *ita* have a similar value and a similar pragmatic strength. It is of course possible that Micio simply decided not to respond emphatically or that he used intonation or other non-verbal cues. But this example once again shows that the boundaries between emphatic and non-emphatic are not clear cut and, more importantly, that any findings should be considered likelihoods, rather than strong conclusions.

5.2.2.1.3   *Sic* + verb

Plautus has three instances, while Terence has 11 [35.2]. Sic occurs with the following verbs:

- Plautus: *futurum est*, *ago*, *dixit*;
- Terence: *sic erit*, *opinor*, *factum est*, *commemineram*.

Compared to verbs which occur with *ita*, the list is shorter and less diverse, which is in line with the assumption that *sic* is at an earlier stage of development than *ita*.

Sic erit is the most frequent; it occurs five [16] times in Terence which points to a relative fixedness:

(27)   *Thraso: si quid collubuit, novi te. hoc si effeceris, quodvis donum praemium a me optato: id optatum auferes.*

Gnatho: itane?

Thraso **sic erit**.

'If you set your heart on something, I know what you can do. If you achieve

this, ask me for any gift you like as a reward; you'll get what you ask.—Really?—Really.' (Terence, *Eunuchus* 1057)

Upon giving his parasite a task, the soldier Thraso promises him that he can ask of him whatever he wants. The parasite Gnatho issues a repair, to which Thraso replies with *sic erit*. The response has to be emphatic. All five cases of *sic erit* respond to a repair, which indicates that the formulation is emphatic.

The fact that the repair *itane* was not responded to by *ita* might be another indication that *ita* by that time lost its emphatic character. Conversely, the repair *sicine* was too strong for this context: almost all occurrences of *sicine* in both authors are uttered with a pejorative connotation.[131]

Longer construction. Terence has a case of *sic res est*,[132] which seems to be parallel to *ita res est*. Since both Panchon (1995) and Thesleff (1960) treat *sic* as emphatic, it is possible that it provided more emphasis than the construction with the frequently used *ita*.

5.2.2.1.4 Summary

The majority of *sic*-responses come from Terence, with only a minimal presence in Plautus. It was hypothesised that this might be a sign of gradual replacement of *ita* and gradual loss of *ita*'s emphatic force.

Regarding the fixity of form, I note that bare *sic* was not attested in Plautus and is in minority in Terence. This indicates that, at the time of Plautus and Terence, *sic* was probably not a positive response particle in the sense of Chapter 3. Instead, most *sic*-responses occur in *sic est* and *sic* + verb formulations. This could suggest a pre-stage which would eventually aid *sic* as a positive response particle to develop. The set of verbs occurring with *sic* is smaller than the one occurring with *ita*, which is consistent with the finding that *sic* was in its beginning stages of development.

5.2.2.2 Antecedents

Table 5.2.2b shows antecedent types which can trigger *sic*.

---

[131] E.g., Plautus, *Persa* 42; *Asinaria* 127; Terence *Adelphoe* 128.
[132] Terence, *Andria* 588.

	Plautus	Terence
Polar question		2 [6.4]
Repair	3	21 [67.2]
Statement	1	5 [16]
Directive	1	

Table 5.2.2b

The range of antecedents which can trigger *sic*-responses is even narrower than that of *ita*-responses. Just like *ita*-responses, *sic*-responses are—except for one occurrence—limited to information antecedents. By far the largest number of occurrences are triggered by the repair antecedent and a smaller, but still significant, number by statements. The minimal presence after polar question might indicate future developments along the trajectory suggested for *ita*.

5.2.2.2.1   Polar question

There are two occurrences, both in Terence. Since one is realised by the construction *sic* + verb (and therefore features *sic* in its primary function), it does not interest us here, so I shall focus on the remaining example, which features a bare *sic*:

(28)   *Demipho: […] quid illa filia amici nostri? quid futurumst?*
          Chremes: recte.
          Demipho: hanc igitur mittimus?
          Chremes: quidni?
          Demipho: illa maneat?
          *Chremes: **sic**.*
          Demipho: ire igitur tibi licet, Nausistrata.
          'What about our friend's daughter? What's to become of her?—It's all right.—
          So we let her go?—Of course.—And the other one stays?—Yes.— You can go
          then, Nausistrata.' (Terence, Phormio 811–3)

Two old men are discussing the future of two women. Our antecedent is the polar question *illa maneat?* While it would be possible to categorise it as a repair, my definition of the repair is asking for clarification of content already expressed, which is not the case here. Since Chremes is asking for complementary information, I consider this a polar question. While it is not

168

possible to determine Demipho's level of surprise from the context, it certainly seems that Chremes' responses are not emphatic. I assume, as in other cases with parallel responses, that both responses, *quidni* 'why not' and *sic*, have the same pragmatic force. Since *quidni*, at least based on its semantic content, does not seem to be emphatic, it is possible to consider *sic* non-emphatic as well. This could suggest that *sic* might have to some extent been used as the neutral positive response particle in Terence's time (but see findings on *sic* after repair antecedents below).

The information being exchanged is atypical in both occurrences, meaning that it is not concluded by the time of speaking and its completion depends on the interactants (even though it concerns a third person). Both main verbs are in the 3rd person and in a non-past tense.

5.2.2.2.2   Repair

The large presence of *sic*-responses after repairs suggests that *sic* was, at the time represented by the corpus, an emphatic positive response strategy. The subset of *sic*-responses triggered by the repair antecedent is large enough to examine typical forms.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Bare		3 [9.6]
With est	1	11 [35.2]
With verb	2	6 [19.2]
With intensifier		
Longer		1 [3.2]

Table 5.2.2c

The table shows that the majority of occurrences triggered by the repair antecedent are realised by *sic est*. While the ratio bare *ita* versus *ita est* after repairs was decisively on the side of *ita*, the data shows that with *sic*, the situation is reversed, with the number of *sic est* more than three times larger than bare *sic*.

As also observed by Thesleff (1960: 27), there are no intensified *sic*-responses, which he sees as evidence that *sic* was more emphatic than *ita*.

5.2.2.2.3   Statement

The second most frequent environment for *sic*-responses is after statement antecedents, that is, antecedents which do not invite a response from Speaker 2.

Table 5.2.2d represents formal realisations of *sic*-responses after statements.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Bare		
With est	1	1 [3.2]
With verb		3 [9.6]
With intensifier		
Longer		1 [3.2]

Table 5.2.2d

There are no bare *sic*-responses, which is in line with the behaviour of *ita*, where it was found that bare *ita* is rare in this environment. However, while *ita* after statements frequently occurs in long responses, *sic* is limited to structures *sic* + verb.

Leaving longer constructions and *sic* + verb aside, I note that in Terence, *sic est* occurs in the feedback function:

(29)   *Pythias: Parmenonis tam scio esse hanc techinam quam me vivere.*
            Dorias: **sic est**.
            Pythias: inveniam pol hodie parem ubi referam gratiam.
            'As sure as I live, I know this is one of Parmeno's tricks.—Quite right.—
            Heaven knows I'll find a way to pay him back in kind today.' (Terence,
            Eunuchus 718–9)

Pythias and Dorias are talking about Parmeno's deviousness. Dorias' interpolation *sic est* is not an attempt to take the floor. Even though Terence had no other option than to represent the sequence of turns linearly, *sic est* was probably uttered simultaneously with Pythias' utterance.

5.2.2.2.4 Directive

There is one instance of a *sic*-response in Plautus triggered by a directive.[133] Since it is realised by the construction *sic* + verb, it does not represent an increase in the applicability of *sic*.

5.2.2.2.5 Summary

Most occurrences of *sic*-responses are triggered by repair antecedents, which indicates that it is an emphatic positive response strategy. The fact, however, that it occurs in a polar question which seems not to have been negatively biased may indicate an increase in the range of environments of its use and that language change was in progress. This is supported by the fact that it was also used in a feedback function, which is not usually associated with strong emphasis.

5.2.2.3 Position in utterance

This section discusses position of *sic* in the utterance. As discussed in Section 3.5 Chapter 3, this should allow us to observe whether the potential positive response particles found in our corpus occur utterance-peripherally and whether they co-occur with other positive responses, as do positive response particles in modern languages.

Table 5.2.2e presents the data for *sic*.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Utterance-internal	5	26 [83.2]
Alone		4 [12.8]
Utterance peripherally		

Table 5.2.2e

There are no utterance-peripheral occurrences of bare *sic* in our corpus. There are four occurrences where *sic* is the only word in response. As discussed in Section 5.2.1.3 for *ita*, these constitute neither positive nor negative evidence for utterance-peripheral uses.

---

[133] Plautus, *Miles gloriosus* 909.

All other uses are utterance-internal, which includes any longer expression in which *sic* occurs; importantly, that includes *sic est*. There are three utterance-peripheral occurrences of *sic est*, two in Plautus and one in Terence. This suggests that *sic est* was also treated as a unit and that some competition existed between *sic est* and *sic*—a situation parallel to *ita/ita est*.

5.2.2.4 Summary

There are no utterance-peripheral occurrences of bare *sic*; which also means it does not co-occur with other positive response strategies. To some extent, *sic est* seems to have been used utterance-peripherally (cf. *ita est* in Section 5.2.1.3).

5.2.3 *Fiat*

While the substance for the non-echo responses studied above is provided by adverbs, this and the next section study verbs in the role of non-echo responses. As all other non-echo positive response strategies, *fiat* also has a primary meaning 'let it be'. While *fiat* does not have reflexes in Romance languages and may be limited to Roman comedy, it is worth describing it due to the potential that subjunctive mood naturally holds for positive response strategies, as evidenced also by *yes*, which, most likely comes from the verb *be* in subjunctive (Wallage and Van der Wurff 2013).

5.2.3.1 Forms

Table 5.2.3a above shows the formal distribution of *fiat*-responses between the two authors.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Fiat	22	10 [32]
Ita fiat		1 [3.2]
Fiat intensified	1	
Fiet	2	3 [6.2]
Ita fiet	1	
Fiet intensified	1	1 [3.2]

Fit intensified	2	
Longer construction	2	

Table 5.2.3a

Most occurrences in both authors are realised by *fiat*. The following example should serve as illustration of the typical use of *fiat* as a response strategy.

(30)   *Tranio: morare hercle, <verba ut> facis. supsequere.*

    *Theopropides: **fiat**. do tibi ego operam.*

    'You're wasting our time with your talk. Follow me.—Yes. I'm at your

    service.' (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 799–804)

The old man Theopropides is having a prolonged, moralising speech. This annoys the slave Tranio, who asks him to stop delaying both of them with his rambling and follow him. The old man responds to this directive by *fiat*. As will be shown in Chapter 6, the reasons for the choice of *fiat* over other positive response strategies (such as the echo response), depend on the social dynamics of the exchange: *fiat* is a linguistic mannerism, typical of old men.

In most cases, I could not identify any reasons for other formal realisations. In cases of *fiet* responses,[134] *fiat* would have been equally acceptable. Since *fiet sedulo* occurs in both authors,[135] it might have been considered a fixed formula. It might have been considered polite at the beginning, although I note that among the occurrences in the corpus, a polite strategy is not always required or expected in the environment where it occurs.[136]

5.2.3.2   Antecedents

Table 5.2.3b shows the distribution of *fiat*-responses over antecedent types.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Directive	25	14 [44.8]
Asking for commitment	2	

---

[134] E.g., Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 593.
[135] Plautus, *Mercator* 302; Terence, *Phormio* 528.
[136] Plautus, *Mercator* 302.

Wish	1	1 [3.2]
Question on future action	3	

Table 5.2.3b

As suggested by the forms of *fiat*-responses (verb in the subjunctive mood or in the future tense), they are in principle incompatible with information antecedents. All occurrences in the corpus are therefore limited to action antecedents. As shown by the table, most of these are triggered by directives, exemplified by (30) above.

As mentioned in Chapter 4, there are two occurrences of *fiat* triggered by an antecedent asking for commitment, both of them realised by bare *fiat*.[137] Both of them concern an act of betrothal, i.e., a direct speech act. While cross-linguistically direct speech acts are usually (but not always, see Vennemann 2009) responded to by the echo response, these occurrences can probably be explained by the social status of the respondents, as will be discussed in Chapter 6.

In the following example, the antecedent is a wish.

(31)   *Ctesipho: [...] quod cum salute eius fiat, ita se defetigarit velim ut triduo hoc perpetuo prorsum e lecto nequeat surgere.*
     *Syrus: **ita fiat**, et istoc si qui potis est rectius.*
     'As long as he doesn't come to any harm, I'd like him to get himself so exhausted that for the next three days he can't get out of bed at all.—Yes indeed, and an even better fate than that if possible.' (Terence, *Adelphoe* 519–21)

Ctesipho wishes for his strict father not to get out of bed that day. The reasons for Syrus' choice of *ita fiat* instead of a bare *fiat* may be that *fiat* is very much entrenched as a positive response strategy to a directive—that is, as an agreement to carry out the desired action—and, additionally, a linguistic mannerism associated with old men.

5.2.3.3   Position in utterance

This section discusses position of *fiat* in the utterance. As discussed in Section 3.5 of Chapter 3, this should allow us to observe whether the potential positive response particles found in our

---

[137] Plautus, *Curculio* 673; Plautus, *Aulularia* 241.

174

corpus occur utterance-peripherally and whether they co-occur with other positive responses, as do positive response particles in modern languages.

Table 5.2.3c presents the data for *fiat*.

	Plautus	*Terence*
Utterance-internal	7	2 [6.8]
Alone	11	9 [28.8]
Utterance-peripherally	13	5 [16]

Table 5.2.3c

There is a significant number of utterance-peripheral positions in both authors.

The sentence position is never filled:

[+particle][−sentence][+additional].

While the content of the 'additional' position is varied, it frequently offers polite paraphrases of *fiat*, such as *fiat, condicio placet*[138] or *fiat, geratur mos tibi*[139], presumably because *fiat* is associated with dominant characters and could be considered too forceful.

5.2.3.4 Summary

Fiat-responses, non-echo positive response strategies originating as a verb, are mostly realised by its basic form *fiat*. Apart from possible idiomatisation and politeness, I was not able to identify pragmatic reasons for formal variation.

The majority of *fiat* responses are triggered by directives. In most cases—with a possible exception of (31) above—*fiat*-responses seems to be interchangeable with echo responses. However, as will be shown in Chapter 6, their distribution depends on the social position of the character and the dynamics of power between the co-interactants.

I do not think that the significant number of utterance-peripheral positions in our corpus indicate that *fiat* has undergone the movement to C-domain, i.e., that it has become a particle,

---

[138] Plautus, *Rudens* 1417.
[139] Plautus, *Asinaria* 40.

especially since, due to its limited range of antecedents, it is unlikely to be used as a conversation management strategy.

5.2.4 *Licet*

Another frequent non-echo positive response strategy, which is attested only in Plautus, is *licet*. From the point of view of the raw material, from which positive responses enter the linguistic system, this seems to be an anomaly. However, as I will attempt to show below, the occurrences satisfy the conditions for postulating a pragmatic function of a positive response, separate from the modal functions of *licet*.

Magni (2009: 193–275), in her excellent treatment of modal forms in Latin, has shown that the difference between deontic readings and epistemic readings of modal forms are reflected in their permitting participants: the less typical the permitting participant, the more likely the epistemic reading. For instance, if the permitting participant is a person, the function of *licet* will be deontic, whereas if the permitting participant is a circumstance the meaning will probably be located towards the epistemic end of the gradient (*ibid.* 219–20). It is important to note that the permitting participant need not be expressed in the co-text; it can be present in the extralinguistic social context, such as the possibility that the speaker belongs to a higher social class.

Now, while both deontic and epistemic modal forms of *licet* require an identifiable permitting/enabling participant or a circumstance, there are cases, where no such participant is identifiable or its existence does not fit into what is known about the interaction and the co-interactants. Let us look at an example.

(32)   *Calidorus: Pseudole, assiste altrim secus atque onera hunc maledictis.*
         *Pseudolus: **licet**. numquam ad praetorem aeque cursim curram, ut emittar manu.*
         'Pseudolus, stand on the other side and pile heaps of abuse onto him.—All right. All right. I'd never run to the praetor equally quickly in order to be set free.' (Plautus, *Pseudolus* 357–8)

The young master Calidorus and his slave Pseudolus prepare to engage in a verbal duel *with* the cheating pimp, who sold the object of Calidorus affection despite the promise that he would not do so. The antecedent is a directive which requires immediate carrying out. Pseudolus responds with *licet*. Now, Pseudolus, being the slave of the one who uttered the directive, has

no authority to utter a deontic *licet* ('it is allowed'). Since he is a member of society who is not regarded as an equal participant in a conversation (Berger 2020a: 27–8), even a non-categorical confirmation via an epistemic *licet* ('it is possible') could land him in trouble. Based on what we know about the relationship between the co-interactants (a close 'young master—slave' relationship, the latter being well-disposed towards the former in this scene and throughout the play) and what one can glean from the scene in which the interaction takes place, I conclude that the link between a modal meaning and *licet* is weak enough for neither of the interactants to be aware of it. Thus, it seems that *licet* functions as nothing more than Pseudolus' agreement in response to Calidorus' directive.

Still, as the raw material for a positive response, *licet* is unusual and is, to my knowledge, the only case of positive response strategy in the European linguistic area having developed from a modal verb of permission/possibility (as opposed to anaphoric or deictic pronouns and similar). It is possible that, despite cases like (32), where the permission/possibility element has been bleached, *licet* was originally a case of linguistic subversion: playing on the modal meanings of 'it is allowed/it is possible', a slave, ever challenging his social status and the dynamic of power with his superiors, might have, by pretending he has a say in the matter, allowed himself this act of a tolerated insubordination. The powerful matron Cleostrata, who performs the function of the *servus callidus* in *Casina* (McCarthy 2000: 77–121), employed *licet* (e.g., *Casina* 421) in a possible case of linguistic characterisation, since *licet* is mostly used by slaves. This pragmatic function of verbal insubordination might have enabled the transition from the modal function to the positive response strategy in the world of Plautine comedy.

Based on a significant number of examples of *licet* used by slaves and non-slaves—and not counting the cases of linguistic characterization—it seems that *licet*, was a positive response strategy acceptable for almost all characters. Take the following example of *licet*, used by Jupiter, pretending to be the old man Amphitruo:

(33)   *Iuppiter: numquid vis?*
         Alcumena: etiam: ut actutum advenias.
         Iuppiter: **licet**, *prius tua opinione hic adero: bonum animum habe.*
         'Do you want anything?—Yes: come here soon.—Yes, I'll be here earlier than you think. Cheer up.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 542–5)

177

In this example, already discussed in this study, Jupiter is trying to leave the conversation, which he signals with the formula *numquid vis*. In response to what was called a procedural question in Chapter 4, Alcumena expresses her wish that he come back soon, to which he responds with *licet*. However, making his power over Alcumena explicit by uttering a non-categorical response with a modal *licet* would not be in his best interest, as he wants to keep his pretend-wife on his good side. Such a dominant stance is, in any case, made less likely by politeness strategies in the remainder of the response. Since Jupiter is pretending to be Amphitruo, the subversive *licet* is also out of the question. This case points to the possibility that *licet* is an accepted, neutral positive response strategy. The following example confirm this view:

(34)   *Philocrates: edepol, Hegio, facis benigne. sed quaeso hominem ut iubeas arcessi.*
Hegio: **licet***. ubi estis vos? ite actutum, Tyndarum huc arcessite.*
'My sincere thanks, Hegio. But please have him brought here.—Of course. Where are you? Go immediately, fetch Tyndarus here.' (Plautus 948–50)

Philocrates had just returned Hegio's son to him, so Hegio is very well disposed towards him. Philocrates requests that his slave, who was wrongfully mistreated by Hegio, be released. Apologetic Hegio immediately agrees. The exchange is between two higher characters with high regard for each other. The directive in the antecedent is softened by two politeness strategies. Hegio responds by *licet* and immediately carries out the directive. Since Philocrates is a free man, *fiat*—which is a speech mannerism of old men and an expression of power— might not have been appropriate, especially towards a person who had just brought back his long-lost son. Since, on the other hand, Hegio is also a free man, he has no need to engage in subversive linguistic behaviour as a slave might. As the example (33) above, (34) shows a use of *licet* where any display of power would not be in the speaker's best interest.

The aim of the paragraphs above was to establish *licet* as a positive response strategy, separate in function from the modal verb from which it arose. Unlike the non-echo positive response strategies treated so far, it does not exhibit any formal variation.

5.2.4.1   Antecedents

Table 5.2.4a shows all the antecedent types which trigger *licet* as a positive response.

178

	Plautus
(Polar question)	2
Directive	34
Intention	1

Table 5.2.4a

The antecedent type which triggers the majority of *licet*-responses, is the directive, requiring immediate action by Speaker 2;[140] in some cases, the directive requests that Speaker 2 cease an action, such as in cases where Speaker 1 instructs Speaker 2 to be quiet.[141]

More rarely, *licet* responds to directives requiring a non-immediate action. Such cases are limited to only two interactions in the Plautine corpus. The first interaction is the example (33) between Alcumena and Jupiter, discussed above, where Jupiter, disguised as Amphitruo, is asked to return home as soon as possible. Alcumena, the utterer of the directive, does not control the state of affairs, so this implies a relatively unspecified time in the future (*actutum* is not used literally). The second such interaction is (35) below. After issuing a series of *licet* in response to a series of directives given to him by the old man Daemones, Trachalio then reroutes the conversation back towards Daemones and issues a series of directives to him. However, while the directives from the master to the slave all concern an errand requiring movement and immediate carrying out, the directives from the slave to the master do not include running errands, but rather bringing something about with the help of his influence.

There is also a case of *licet* used as an agreement to a suggestion (categorised here as question on future action, initiated by *vin…*, which usually trigger an echo response, see Chapter 4).

(35) *Callidamates: visne ego te ac tu me amplectare?*
   *Delphium: si tibi cordi est, **facere licet**.*
   'Do you want me to embrace you and you me?—If it pleases you, we can do so.' (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 323)

Callidamates, in Plautus' *Mostellaria*, suggests to his lover Delphium that they embrace. The antecedent, a polite suggestion, is responded to by an equally polite response, featuring *licet*.

---

[140] Plautus, *Menaechmi* 158.
[141] Plautus, *Bacchides* 35.

This is a borderline example: even though it is a positive response strategy, the subject infinitive is not elided which suggests a modal meaning as well. Since it is not possible to separate the deontic and positive response function, it is not included in Table 5.2.4a. It is quite possible, however, that for Delphium, her response is merely a longer version of *licet* as a positive response strategy (cf. similar suggestion regarding *faciam* and *ita faciam* in Section 5.2.1.1.3).

For the following exchange, the correct readings have not been sufficiently agreed upon.

(36)　　*Libanus: […] quid istuc est negoti?*
Leonida certum est credere.
Libanus: audacter.
*Leonida: **licet**, sis amanti subvenire familiari filio […].*
'What's that business of yours?—I've decided to entrust it to you.—You can do so with confidence.—Okay, if you want to help our young master in his love affair.'
(Plautus, *Asinaria* 308–9)

In this passage from *Asinaria*, the slaves Libanus and Leonida are hatching a plan to help their young master to win his love interest. In this version (De Melo 2011), the antecedent to *licet* seems to be *audacter*, understood as heavily elided '[you may entrust it to me] boldly'. To this Leonida replies *licet* and then exposes his plan. This antecedent is itself a positive response strategy to an expression of intention (which, according to the categories proposed in Section 2.4 of Chapter 2, would fall under 'Other' positive response strategies). The conversational structure of this reading would be as follows:

A: expression of intention
B: agreement
A: evaluation + action

This, however, would be a unique use of *licet*, since all other cases of *licet* act as a response to a directive, that is, it always occurs in the reactive move and never in the third, evaluative move:

FPP: directive
SPP: licet

Leo's edition (1895) proposes a different reading:

(37)   *Libanus: […] quid istuc est negoti?*

         Leonida certum est credere.

         *Libanus: audacter **licet**.*

         Leonida: sis amanti subvenire familiari filio […].

         'What's that business of yours?—I've decided to entrust it to you.—You can

         do so with confidence.—Okay, if you want to help our young master in his

         love affair.' (Plautus, *Asinaria* 308–9)

In this case, *licet* is given to Libanus, making the response *audacter licet*, after which Leonida proceeds to expose his plan. This yields the following conversational structure:

A: expression of intention
B: agreement
A: intended action

According to this reading, the antecedent is an expression of intention, which triggers the response *audacter licet*. This reading is potentially supported by *lepide licet* in Plautus, *Bacchides* 35. The reading in (36) above might have been influenced by a modern intuition about positive response strategies, brought about by phrases such as 'alright, listen…'. While *licet* as a positive response strategy and *alright* in English suggest some parallels, the corpus does not support this reading. A quantitatively oriented study of a pragmatic phenomenon thus assists in establishing the correct reading of a text.

In terms of information antecedents, there are two cases where *licet* responds to a question, both part of a marked interaction between the old man Daemones and the slave Trachalio in *Rudens*. Daemones gives Trachalio a series of directives, to which Trachalio keeps responding *licet* so mechanically that he even interrupts Daemones' flow of speech with it. The annoyed Daemones stops the parroting with the question:

(38)   *Daemones: omnian licet?*

         *Trachalio: **licet**. sed scin quid est quod te volo? […]*

         'Okay to everything?—Okay. But do you know what I want from you? […]'
         (Plautus, *Rudens* 1216)

Trachalio's response to the information antecedent is *licet*, but only to continue his okaying to further annoy Daemones and for a humorous effect. In the same turn, he reverses the roles and

181

unleashes on Daemones a series of directives of his own, to which Daemones retaliates with a parallel series of mechanical okaying. The series of *licet* again ends with a question:

(39)   *Trachalio: omnia<n> licet?*

*Daemones: **licet**: tibi rursum refero gratiam.*

'Okay to everything?—Okay: I'm paying you back in your own coin. But be quick to go to the city at once and return here again.' (Plautus, *Rudens* 1222)

For the sake of completeness, both questions are included in the Table 5.2.4a, but are obviously marked and thus do not represent a typical function of *licet*. It should also be noted that despite the superficial similarity to the echo response, this is not a case of the echo response as a positive response strategy, but rather a case of aesthetically motivated repetition, discussed in Chapter 4. While the responses in (38) and (39) do repeat the *licet* in the antecedent, they also repeat the whole series of it in the preceding lines to achieve a humorous effect, and not to provide a positive response to the question—even though the effectiveness of the joke obviously rests on the fact that *licet* is a positive response strategy in other contexts and on the clever blurring of the lines between the aesthetic and grammatical echoing.

5.2.4.2   Position in utterance

This section discusses the position of *licet* in the utterance. as discussed in Section 3.5 of Chapter 3, this should allow us to observe whether the potential positive response particles found in our corpus occur utterance-peripherally and whether they co-occur with other positive responses, as do positive response particles in modern languages.

Table 5.2.4b presents the data for *licet*.

	Plautus
Utterance-internal	3
Alone	23
Utterance-peripherally	12

Table 5.2.4b

12 occurrences out of 28 occur utterance-peripherally.

The [sentence] position is never filled, when *licet* is used:

[+particle][−sentence][+additional].

As in the case of *fiat*, the content in the [additional] position is mostly unpredictable, but frequently contains polite paraphrases and additions, which render the response less direct, such as *licet, pulchre ammonuisti*[142] or *licet, prius tua opinione hic adero*[143].

5.2.4.3 Summary

This section discussed grounds for postulating a separate, positive response function of *licet*. It showed, first of all, that the permitting/enabling participant (even atypical, see Magni 2009: 219–20) is frequently absent; secondly, the power dynamics between participants is such that modal interpretation is frequently not tenable, as in (32), where *licet* is issued by a slave to his master.

Licet exhibits no formal variation (*ita licet). The cases where it occurs with infinitive (*facere licet* as in (35)), are not considered positive response strategies, but rather primary functions of *licet* (modal verbs).

In terms of antecedents which trigger *licet*, it is even more homogenous than *fiat*, with all occurrences but one triggered by a directive.

I conclude that *licet* has not undergone the movement to C-domain, i.e., it has not become a positive response particle: first of all, the positive response function of *licet* is limited to Plautus; secondly, it has an extremely narrow range of antecedents, which is considered the main indicator of the utility and pervasiveness of a positive response strategy (see Potočnik 2023); finally, it is very likely that *licet* as a positive response strategy, like *fiat*, was a feature of the artistic language/theatre-speak of Roman comedy.

5.2.5 *Etiam*

Etiam is sometimes cited as one of the most likely candidates for the equivalent of *yes* in Latin (e.g., Pinkster 1972: 40). Despite some insistence (Brown *et al.* 2009: 516, Christenson 2000: 239, Oxford Latin dictionary), that it was a positive response particle already in the corpus of Plautus and Terence, I suggest that this was not necessarily the case.

---

[142] Plautus, *Miles gloriosus* 536–7.
[143] Plautus, *Amphitruo* 545.

The following is an example.

(40)   *Iuppiter: numquid vis?*

        Alcumena: **etiam***: ut actutum advenias.*

        'Do you want anything?—Yes: come here soon.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 543–5)

Jupiter, disguised as Alcumena's husband Amphitruo, is trying to leave the conversation. The antecedent is the standard leave-taking formula *numquid vis*, appearing regularly in both authors, something along the lines of *will there be anything else?* This antecedent is normally responded by an equally formulaic *vale* or similar. In this case, however, it triggers the so-called delayed exit (Karakasis 2013: 219), where Speaker 2 ignores the actual illocutionary force of *numquid vis* (= I am leaving) and deliberately misinterprets it as a polar question. This enables the speaker to prolong the ending of a scene.

There are several reasons why one might consider it a positive response particle, starting with its position at the beginning of the utterance. As such, it has all the makings of a positive response particle, even a turn-taking strategy. This impression is aided by the presence of the colon in the edition, which suggests that *etiam* is a separate prosodic unit. Another reason for interpreting *etiam* as a positive response strategy—perhaps the most important one—is our expectation as to what a response in a conversation is supposed to look like. The set of appropriate responses to a polar question is restricted by our conversational expectations. Our mental lexicon stores all the possible positive responses to a given antecedent in a given context. The more often one encounters a response to a given antecedent in a given context, the more expected the response. It is perhaps not an exaggeration to say that in most positive responses in spontaneous conversation in a modern European language, a positive response particle is followed by some additional content, rather than appearing by itself. This is why the translation of *etiam* in the Loeb edition—'Yes: come here soon'—works very well and allows for a dynamic and fluent reading—it is expected in a conversation as we know it.

This intuition is less helpful in trying to determine the precise meaning of a word in ancient sources. It is probably the combination of this intuition and overt contextual clues (the position in the utterance, a separate prosodic unit) which makes it more likely for *etiam* to be seen as the positive response strategy. The example (40) is cited as the first illustrative example for *etiam* as a positive response particle in Brown *et al.* (2009: 516). Christenson (2000: 239) explains *etiam* as a colloquial *yes*, explicitly referring to the fifth meaning of *etiam* in Oxford Latin dictionary (which was presumably the source for Brown *et al.* 2009: 516 as well).

However, by zooming out and seeing the exchange in a wider context, another explanation becomes plausible.

(41)   *Iuppiter: numquid vis?*

        Alcumena: **ut** *quom apsim me ames, me tuam te apsenti tamen.*

        Mercurius: eamus, Amphitruo. lucescit hoc iam.

        Iuppiter: abi prae, Sosia; iam ego sequar. numquid vis?

        Alcumena: **etiam***: ut actutum advenias.*

        Iuppiter: licet, prius tua opinione hic adero: bonum animum habe.

        'Do you want anything?—Yes: love me when I'm not around, me, the woman belonging to you, whether you're around or not.—Let's go, Amphitruo. Day's dawning already.—Go ahead, Sosia; I'll follow in a moment. … Do you want anything?—Yes: come here soon.—Yes, I'll be here earlier than you think. Cheer up,' Plautus, *Amphitruo* 542–55)

The wider context in (41) shows that Jupiter utters his *numquid vis* twice—the second one probably delivered with some irritation—hoping that Alcumena would get the hint and let him go. However, she delays him both times, listing her wishes. Her first wish starts with a case of implicit confirmation, where both the [particle] position as well as the [sentence] position are empty (See Section 3.5 of Chapter 3). This positive response strategy is very frequent in the corpus. In English, it is unusual in unmarked contexts, as evidenced by the fact that the translator felt the need to supply 'yes' in translation. Her second wish—after the second *numquid vis* by Jupiter—is introduced by *etiam*. Despite the temptation to see it as a positive response particle, the correct interpretation for *etiam* is in my opinion its primary meaning of 'also', which means that in her second response, too, the positive response is implicit. It also implies that *etiam* belongs to the [additional] position, not to the [particle] position.

The 'cohesive *etiam*' interpretation is made more plausible by the following example from Bacchides.

(42)   *Chrysalus: animum advortite. Mnesiloche et tu, Pistoclere, iam facite in biclinio cum amica sua uterque accubitum eatis, ita negotium est, atque ibidem ubi nunc sunt lecti strati potetis cito.*

        Pistoclerus: numquid aliud?

        Chrysalus: **hoc atque etiam***: ubi erit accubitum semel, ne quoquam exsurgatis, donec a me erit signum datum.*

> 'Pay attention, you two. Mnesilochus and you, Pistoclerus, make sure now that you go to lie down, each of you in a double couch with his girlfriend, that's your job, and make sure that you quickly start drinking there where the couches have been laid out now.—Anything else?—Just this, and one more thing: once you've reclined, don't get up to go anywhere, until you get a sign from me.' (Plautus, *Bacchides* 753–8)

Pistoclerus, who had just been given a task, signals his intention to leave with *numquid aliud*. The structure of Chrysalus' response is similar to the one in (41) above. Interpreting the phrase as a polar question, he tells Pistoclerus *another* thing he wants and uses *etiam* as a cohesive device between the two wishes. Unlike Alcumena, however, he resumes his first wish with the anaphoric *id* (referring to his previous order), thus making the cohesive function of *etiam* more salient. The positive response strategy employed is, again, implicit confirmation.

It may be significant that Amphitruo was first performed around the same time as *Bacchides*—in 188 BCE, that is, a year later than *Bacchides* (189 BCE). Plautus, having worked on one play, might well have been primed to use the same response to *numquid vis* in another play. He might also have reproduced it on purpose, aware that the audience appreciated the formulaic character of his dialogues. It is also useful to keep in mind that, while only two occurrences surfaced in our record, a play was probably performed several times and a similar dialogue might have been used in one of the numerous other Plautine plays, as well as those by other authors.[144]

This is not to say that all occurrences of *etiam* in positive responses can be straightforwardly explained by the cohesive interpretation. Of the instances of confirmative *etiam* recorded by Thesleff (1960), (43) and (44) are worth taking a closer look at.

(43)   *Theopropides: numquid processit ad forum hodie novi?*
         *Simo: **etiam**.*
         Theopropides: quid tandem?
         Simo: vidi efferri mortuom.
         Theopropides: hem!
         'Has anything new come up at the forum today?—Yes.—And what?—I saw a dead man being carried out—Oh!' (Plautus, *Mostellaria* 999–1000)

---

[144] See Terence, *Hecyra* 811 for another example.

Theopropides asks Simo, who is just returning from the forum, whether anything interesting happened on the forum, to which Simo enthusiastically replies that it has. It is, based on this case alone, hard to decide, whether it is an emphatic particle on the level of *of course* or a neutral *yes*. The shocking information which follows might tip the balance toward emphatic. While we have no other content in the response to judge its position in the utterance, its position in the verse might be indicative of its character. Everything from *etiam* to *hem* is one verse, a trochaic septenarius, which indicates a lively and combative conversational pace (Christenson 2000: 56). In such an environment, an emphatic use of *etiam* (presumably 'climactic' *etiam* in Thesleff 1960: 35) is more than likely. This use might be related to *immo etiam* (see below).

The following example, found as an example of confirmative *etiam* in Thesleff (1960: 35) and listed under the fifth meaning of *etiam* of the Oxford Latin Dictionary, is even more problematic, even from the point of view of textual criticism: in different editions, three different readings of *etiam* are proposed. The following is the version from the Loeb Edition (2011), used in this study:

(44)   *Agorastocles: i ergo strenue.*
         Adelphasium: sequere me, soror.
         Agorastocles: atque audin?
         *Adelphasium: **etiam**?*
         Agorastocles: Veneri dicito multum meis verbis salutem.
         'Then go quickly.—Follow me, my sister.—And can you hear me?—Again?—
         Give my best regards to Venus.' (Plautus, *Poenulus* 405–7)

This reading follows the Ambrosian Palimpsest and gives *etiam* to Adelphasium. Curiously, it interprets *etiam* as a question. This reading offers an interesting parallel to (41) and (42) above. In another case of a delayed exit, Agorastocles, who sends Adelphasium off, calls her back, because he has another directive for her. Adelphasium's *etiam* might in this case be a deliberate and perhaps ironic reworking of the uses in (41) and (42): it would have Adelphasium anticipate and poke fun at the formulaic dialogue, which is neither unlikely nor unprecedented in the Plautine plays. If the reading is correct, it is another piece of evidence that *etiam* is conventionally interpreted in its primary sense, rather than as a positive response particle. It also supports the idea suggested above—that just like *numquid vis*, *etiam* is a conventional part of a delayed exit formula, used to pile on directives on the exiting character.

The reason that Thesleff (1960: 34–5) cites *etiam* as a positive response particle is that he worked with Ernout's edition which, following the Ambrosian Palimpsest, also gives *etiam* to Adelphasium. As opposed to the Loeb edition (2011), however, he interprets it as a positive response strategy. This use of a positive response strategy in this function is very frequent in modern languages, e.g., *Hey you!—Yes?* However, this reading is problematic because this would be, as far as I know, the only case of a positive response strategy in the corpus used in response to a call. It is therefore likely that this interpretation was influenced by modern intuitions about functions of a positive response strategy, which is not in line with our Latin sources.

Leo's edition (1895), on the other hand, gives *etiam* to Agorastocles, deleting Adelphasium's move altogether. Agorastocles' move thus reads: *At audin etiam?*—something like: 'Hey, one more thing'—immediately followed by his request. This reading is supported by *Asinaria* 109, where the same question occurs and where it is even less likely that *etiam* was interpreted as a response.[145]

I attempted to show above that *etiam* was not a positive response particle. One example—(43)—suggests that it might have been an emphatic strategy. Since not even one occurrence can be conclusively shown to be a positive response particle according to the criteria outlined in Section 3.2.2 of Chapter 3, one should not too hastily attribute this additional meaning——an additional layer of development—to *etiam*. This is, of course, not to claim that *etiam* was not a positive response particle in spoken Latin of the 3rd and 2nd century BCE—only that the corpus of Plautus and Terence does not reflect it.

Admittedly, the impulse to see *etiam* as a positive response particle can be excused on multiple grounds, the chief one being that, by the time of Cicero, *etiam* seems to have achieved that status, as the following example shows:

(45)   *Utrum cetera nomina in codicem accepti et expensi digesta habes an non? Si*
        ***non**, quo modo tabulas conficis? si **etiam**, quam ob rem, cum cetera nomina in*
        ordinem referebas, hoc nomen triennio amplius, quod erat in primis magnum,
        in adversariis relinquebas?
        'Have you arranged all the other items of receipts and expenses in the ledger

---

[145] *Libanus: i, bene ambula. / Demaenetus: atque audin **etiam**? / Libanus: ecce. / Demaenetus: si quid te volam, ubi eris?* 'Go ahead, have a good walk.—Are you still listening?—Yes.—If I want anything from you, where will you be?' (Plautus, *Asinaria* 108–110).

or not? If you have not, how do you make up your books? if you have, why is it that, when entering all the other items in order, you left this item, which was an extremely large one, for more than three years in your day-book?' (Cicero, *Pro Roscio* 3.8–9)

In (45), Cicero imagines a dialogue with a certain Fannius regarding his unsatisfactory bookkeeping. He poses a polar question and imagines both a positive and a negative response, showing that Fannius was dishonest in either case. Now, since in some cases, the non-echo response was necessary due to the absence of a verb, it is worth noting that the echo response—*si habes … si non habes*—would have worked perfectly well in this case. This indicates that *etiam* was equivalent to the echo response. Furthermore, using *etiam* in parallel with the negative response particle *non*—which was used as a negative response particle in Terence— is further evidence that *etiam* is a grammaticalized positive response particle as well. If *etiam* was not a positive response particle, embedding it in a sentence as a clause substitute (comparable to (4) in Section 3.2.2 of Chapter 3) would not have been possible.

To this, one can adduce a later example of Pliny, *Epistulae* 4.13.3,[146] where the author reports a dialogue with a young boy, who, when asked whether he goes to school, responds with *etiam*; and especially *Vetus Latina*, *Matt. 5.37*, where the Greek *ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ* is rendered as *etiam etiam, non non* in Latin.[147] These any many more examples[148] show that *etiam* was used as a positive response particle by the time of Cicero and gained considerable currency by the time of Late Latin.

Two occurrences of *etiam* are found in a fixed phrase with *immo*.

(46)   *Nicobulus: occidistis me; nimio hic priuatim seruaretur rectius. sed nilne <huc> attulistis inde auri domum?*
         *Chrysalus: **immo etiam**. uerum quantum attulerit nescio.*
         'You've killed me. It would have been guarded much better here in private. But didn't you two bring any gold home here from there?—We did. But I don't know how much he brought.' (Plautus, *Bacchides* 313–6)

---

[146] *Proxime cum in patria mea fui, venit ad me salutandum municipis mei filius praetextatus. Huic ego"Studes?" inquam. Respondit: "**Etiam**." "Ubi?" "Mediolani"* 'I was visiting my native town a short time ago when the young son of a fellow-citizen came to pay his respects to me. "Do you go to school?" I asked. "Yes," he replied. "Where?" "In Mediolanum." (Pliny, *Epistulae* 4.13.3).
[147] The Vulgate has *est est, non non*.
[148] See *etiam* in *Thesaurus Linguae latinae* for a rich list of occurrences from all periods; see also Thesleff (1960: 35, note 4) for further references.

(47)   *Davus: quid tu? quo hinc te agis?*

Charinus: verum vis dicam?

*Davus: **immo etiam**. narrationis incipit mi initium.*

'What about you? Where are you going?—Do you want me to tell you the truth?—Yes indeed. Here begins a tale.' (Terence *Andria* 708)

In (47), the antecedent is a negatively biased question. To provide a positive response to it, a specialized positive response strategy is necessary, such as *si* in French or *doch* in German, and others. This function is often fulfilled by *immo* (see Thesleff 1960) Similarly, in (8), the antecedent is a slightly surprising polar question—Davus, naturally, wants to hear the truth, which he confirms with an emphatic *immo etiam*. Both occurrences seem to be separate prosodic units.

Despite some insistence that *etiam* had the force of *yes* in Plautus and Terence, I have tried to show here that this is unlikely. In two cases, (41) and (42), considering its position vis-à-vis other components of a response, it was shown that *etiam* should be read in its primary meaning of 'also'. In one case, *etiam* could be a positive response particle. However, an emphatic reading (precluding it from the particle status) cannot be excluded. The shocking nature of the next move by the same speaker and the proximity (relation?) to the definitely emphatic *immo etiam*, make the emphatic reading even likely. Since it appears alone, we cannot judge, whether it would appear in the [particle] or in [additional] position.

Based on the evidence from Plautus, *etiam* might have been an emphatic positive response strategy in the corpus (the low frequency of occurrence is in principle not an obstacle to this conclusion), but almost certainly not a particle. The evidence from Cicero, Pliny, and Late Latin sources, oh the other hand, indicate that it was a positive response particle by the time of Cicero.

5.3   Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed selected non-echo responses in Plautus and Terence: *ita*, *sic*, *fiat*, and *licet*. The aim was to determine to what extent the basic properties of positive response particles, established in Chapter 3, hold for them; to see, ultimately, whether any of them can be considered a positive response particle. These basic properties are: neutrality; provision of no more than polarity; formal fixedness; utterance-peripheral position; and co-occurrence with other positive response strategies.

Formal analysis showed that bare *ita* is entrenched enough to be considered formally fixed. Other constructions in which it occurs do not preclude this conclusion, since their pragmatic force is mostly not the same as that of *ita* as a positive response particle.

Determining whether *ita* is a neutral positive response strategy is less straightforward. It was predicted in Chapter 3 that strong presence of a positive response strategy after repair antecedents is indicative of an inherent emphasis. *Ita* to some extent exhibits such presence: it is its second most frequent environment. Additionally, based on the close analysis of several examples in this chapter, it is certainly possible to conclude that *ita* was emphatic. However, its use as a turn-taking and feedback strategy, as well as after polar questions which do not require an emphatic response, seems to be at odds with that interpretation. Based on the information presented here and on the fact that there are signs of a wider usage of *ita* in Terence than in Plautus, I propose that the qualitative analysis should carry more weight and that in real-life situations, *ita* was neutral.

While it was shown that several constructions which contain *ita* have meanings other than the provision of polarity (such as politeness, as in the case of longer constructions), I noticed no other layer of meaning in bare *ita*.

Based the data, it also seems that *ita* can occur utterance-peripherally and can, in addition, co-occur with other positive response strategies. In all cases, it occurs on the left side.

The formal analysis shows that bare *sic* was not formally fixed. In Plautus, there are no occurrences, while in Terence they are limited. The only possible formal fixation during the period in question seems to have occurred with *sic est* and *sic erit*.

Based on the fact that *sic* mainly occurs after repair antecedents, I conclude, together with Thesleff 1960: 27), that it was inherently emphatic. Unlike in the case if *ita*, qualitative analysis does not suggest otherwise. Beside emphasis, I did not identify any other layers of meaning in *sic*-responses. That, however, is sufficient to conclude that *sic*-responses provide more than polarity, so this basic property does not hold for *sic*.

No occurrence of bare *sic* is utterance-peripheral. This might be explained by the fact that *sic* was emphatic and as such cannot be used in conversation management and other phatic functions; as observed for *ita*, however, utterance-peripheral occurrences usually have precisely those functions.

Since *fiat* and *licet* cannot be used after information antecedents at all, they can only partially be analysed according to the basic properties proposed here. They are both formally fixed (despite limited formal variation of *fiat*). They can only provide agreement to directives, so the properties of the provision of polarity and lack of emphasis are not applicable here. They can both occur utterance-peripherally; however, since they cannot provide polarity, this information is of limited value for our purposes. As will be shown in Chapter 6, *fiat* and *licet* are better analysed according to social parameters.

The qualitative analysis showed that *etiam* is unlikely to have been an equivalent of *yes* at the time of Plautus and Terence. It was shown, however, that in the subsequent development, it joined the ranks of positive response particles. Since, based on one example, it could have been used as an emphatic positive response particle, it could have been comparable to *sic* or the modern *sim* in Brazilian Portuguese, which is also emphatic. This would be compatible with the trajectory proposed for positive response particles:

more emphatic > less emphatic > non-emphatic

The results, then, suggest, that for *ita*, all the basic properties hold; no basic property holds for *sic*; and only one property holds for *fiat* and *licet*. For *etiam*, I have only identified one example which can fit the definition of a positive response strategy, so the evidence for an analysis in terms of the framework proposed in Chapter 3, is insufficient. While even for *ita* the data suggests a fairly rigid division between the information and the action antecedents, the outlier examples—a few cases where *ita* does respond to an action antecedent—suggest that the situation on the ground might be more complex that the state of affairs represented by the corpus. According to the Karstic model, proposed by Palmer (1954), these outlier examples could be considered bursts of real-life usage, which made their way into our sources, which are otherwise constrained by other factors, such as literary standard and other conventions of the genre, such as idiomatic expressions, typical for Roman comedy. In such a case, *ita* fits the definition of a positive response particle.

6   Positive Response Strategies and Dynamics of Power

6.1   Introduction

This chapter studies the social variable in the choice of positive response strategies. This was not essential in responses triggered by information antecedents, where the 'commodity exchanged' (Halliday 1984) is information. However, an important part of the database used in this study represents action antecedents, the most important among which is the directive. The desired state of affairs upon issuing a directive is not limited to exchanging information, but rather making someone do something, that is, impinging on their freedom of movement. Action antecedents—especially directives—thus embody the social dynamics present between the co-interactants. If issuing a directive implies having power over someone, then responding positively to it implies some degree of submission. The purpose of this chapter is to find out whether this is reflected in the choice of the positive response strategies by the stock characters in the comedies of Plautus and Terence.

Additionally, the authors are known to have engaged in the so-called 'language characterisation', that is, enriching their characters with particular speech mannerisms: old men, for instance, were associated with long-windedness (Maltby 1979, Karakasis 2005: 62–82, etc.). One goal of this chapter is to see whether particular positive response strategies might be associated with particular characters.

Since the analysis in this chapter is to some extent exploratory, I limit the analysis to two positive response strategies only. In Section 6.2, I analyse the echo response of compliance, the subtype of the echo response (identified and defined in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4). In Section 6.3, I analyse *fiat*, one of the two non-echo responses which are, to a large extent, limited to directives. I have chosen *fiat* over *licet* for the simple reason that it is present in both authors and the results will thus be more widely applicable.

6.2   Echo Response of Compliance

Table 6.2a shows the results of the quantitative analysis of the social distribution of the echo response of compliance in my corpus.

Plautus		*Terence*

193

	Tokens	1 occurrence per X lines	Tokens	1 occurrence per X lines
Higher characters	19	348.7	12	242.6
Lower characters	52	174.7	14	139.8

Table 6.2a

The echo response is used more frequently by the stock characters lower in social status (henceforward 'lower characters') than by the stock characters higher in social status (henceforward 'higher characters'): in Plautus by the approximate factor of two and in Terence by the approximate factor of 1.7. This suggests that in both authors, this was a characteristic feature of the language of lower characters. It is worth underlining that this label should be taken quite literally—as a characteristic feature of the language of characters of the Roman comedy—and should not be thought to apply straightforwardly to the Roman society or to the Latin of the streets in the 2nd century BCE. Moreover, while the presence of a linguistic feature in both authors may, in theory, strengthen the case that a phenomenon found in both authors reflects real-life linguistic habits of the Romans, such conclusions have to be drawn with great caution, at least until all comedy-internal explanations have been excluded, such as stock character conventions or conventions of stage management (see Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4). The default position in this chapter is that any linguistic tendencies encountered apply to the fictional world of Roman comedy—the applicability of conclusions to the real world should be discussed on a case-by-case basis.

Table 6.2b shows the distribution of echo response of compliance among the stock characters.

	Plautus		*Terence*	
	Tokens	1 occurrence per X lines	Tokens	1 occurrence per X lines
Old man	7	468.3	6	275.6
Matron	3	174.6		
Youth	9	305.3	6	177.4

Soldier	4	91.7		
Slave	26	207.5	10	110.2
Maid	13	52	2	106.35
Parasite	6	114.5		
Courtesan			1	240.1
Pimp	3	227.9	1	67.7

Table 6.2b

In Plautus, it is the lower characters with low line counts which have the strongest incidence of the echo response of compliance: the maid, the soldier, and the parasite. In Terence, the pimp and the slave have the highest incidence. So far, the hypothesis based on Table 6.2a above is confirmed. Male slaves in Plautus, while in terms of incidence after the matrons, have the highest token frequency. Among all the lower characters, they represent the main body of evidence that the echo response of compliance is a characteristic feature of the speech of lower characters. Examples (47)–(49) in Chapter 4 are representative of these exchanges.

It is potentially relevant that these lower characters in fact fall into two groups: those who have little hope for their lot to change—slaves—and those which continuously strive to improve it—the parasite and the soldier. The latter—whose main motivation in the play is to advance their social prospects—could be expected to use linguistic strategies which would aid them in their efforts, such as linguistic adaptation—i.e., upgrading their language to a more prestigious register;[149] and they do engage in it (see Section 6.3 on *fiat*). However, for such strategies to be effective, the linguistic strategy used for linguistic adaptation must be salient, which in this study translates to having a low frequency relative to the baseline speech—i.e., how they normally speak. The features of the baseline speech will, in turn, translate to a high frequency. Assuming that the echo response of compliance is a feature of the speech of lower characters, then especially the stock characters anxious about their social position will display a high frequency of it. In this sense, a high incidence of the echo response of compliance in socially anxious characters potentially strengthens the case that it belongs to the speech of lower

---

[149] See the example (5) below.

characters: for the audience to detect an unusual speech pattern, it must first be made clear what the usual pattern is. The echo response of compliance, I argue, falls into the latter category.

The usual caveats regarding the small sample size apply. However, in view of the above, it is entirely plausible that Plautus and Terence deliberately marked the baseline idiom of the socially anxious characters with a feature which is expected from someone of their social status. In the characters with low line counts, the space for linguistic characterization is, from the author's point of view, limited; thus, a high incidence of the echo response of compliance in a stock character with a low line count backs up the conclusion that that feature is characteristic for that character.

If the echo response of compliance really is a feature of the language of the lower characters, one would expect that its incidence in the higher characters should be low or at least not very high. This expectation is confirmed for the old man and the youth, but not for the matron, whose incidence is, indeed, higher than that of the Plautine slaves. This requires an explanation (in this light, it is also interesting that in the Terentian matron, the echo response of compliance is not attested; see Section 6.3 on *fiat*). However, assuming that the hypothesis above holds, the use of the echo response of compliance in higher characters in general does not require an explanation: in real life, speakers of different classes, ages, and genders employ linguistic variables to different degrees, depending on the co-interactants or the setting of the conversation (Clackson 2011: 526). In other words, a limited incidence of a variable in one stock character does not invalidate the conclusion that this variable is characteristic of another stock character in which it appears with a higher incidence. Nevertheless, it will be useful to examine the use of the echo response of compliance in higher characters to determine in what conversational settings they use it and to see whether any generalities could be drawn from these passages. In what follows, I will examine several uses of the echo response of compliance in atypical contexts: those used by the old man, the youth, and the matron.

The following passage concerns Simo, the old man in Plautus' *Pseudolus*. Pseudolus is a typical Plautine play, with a poor and not very resourceful youth in love, with the object of his desire in the hands of an evil pimp, and a clever slave recruited to secure the woman for his young master. Simo is a stingy old man, from whom the money to buy the girl from the pimp is to be secured. The passage appears at the end of the last scene, after the youth and the girl have been brought together and the pimp completely ruined. The scene is remarkable for Simo's bizarre mood swings, which have drawn attention for being somewhat inconsistent with the

storyline.[150] The passage represents the last swing: the saturnalian role reversal between Simo and Pseudolus. Since it contains a cluster of the echo responses of compliance and a certain progression into the role reversal is discernible, I cite it in full.

(1) *Pseudolus: redi.*

Simo: quid redeam?

Pseudolus: redi modo: non eris deceptus.

Simo: **redeo**.

Pseudolus: simul mecum i potatum.

Simo: egone eam?

Pseudolus: fac quod te iubeo. si is, aut dimidium aut plus etiam faxo hinc feres.

Simo: **eo, duc me quo vis**.

Pseudolus: quid nunc? numquid iratus es aut mihi aut filio propter has res, Simo?

Simo: nil profecto.

Pseudolus: i hac.

Simo **te sequor**. *quin vocas spectatores simul?*

'Come back.—Why should I come back?—Just come back; you won't be deceived.—I'm coming back.—Go for a drink with me.—I should go?—Do what I tell you. If you go, I'll make sure that you'll carry away half the money or even more.—I'm going, take me where you want.—Well then? You aren't angry with me or your son because of this, are you, Simo?—Not at all.—Go this way.—I'm following you.' (Plautus, *Pseudolus* 1326–31)

The passage contains three echo responses of compliance, all verbs of movement. The antecedents in the three cases are directives, realised with imperatives, which are not typical of slaves addressing their masters, but very typical of masters addressing slaves (Barrios-Lech 2016: 218–22).[151] The directives in the antecedent all require immediate movement. Simo, here in the submissive role, responds to the directives with echo responses of compliance. After the more or less explicit hints that the saturnalian scene is imminent a few lines before, the reversal is really brought into effect with the quick succession of the three imperatives. If after the first

---

[150] The mood swings are discussed in De Melo (2011: 232–3).
[151] While not analysed here, the imperative echo responses should be interesting to analyse in terms of social variables.

two directives Simo hesitates with several repairs—the questioning of the reversal further underlining the saturnalian effect—he is brought into complete submission after Pseudolus' uttering *fac quod te iubeo*. This final stage in the reversal is underlined by Simo's second echo response—*duc me quo vis*—which is even more submissive, and the substitution of the last echo response.

This passage places a cluster of three echo responses of compliance in a saturnalian role reversal, at the very end of the play—a salient and memorable position. As observed by Barrios-Lech (2016: 238), Roman playwrights cluster the speaker's characterizing features at entrances, exits, and beginnings of speeches. The saturnalian scenes themselves are fruitful spots for linguistic analysis: for the saturnalian scene to be an effective comic tool, one can imagine that the speech characteristics of the imitated stock character should have been greatly exaggerated; in other words, for an old man to pass for a slave, he would have to adopt and comically exaggerate the linguistic characteristics of a slave. An appearance of three characteristic features in a saturnalian scene, in the closing lines of a comedy, thus strengthens the case that the echo response of compliance is a feature of lower characters.

The youth in the Roman comedy tends to be presented as weak, gullible, helpless, and desperately in love, which prompted another name for the stock character—*adulescens amator*. Indeed, it is this predicament around which the Plautine plot is typically constructed. The following exchange is from Plautus' comedy *Asinaria*. The youth of the play is called Argyrippus. Even for a traditionally helpless character, Argyrippus is particularly weak and pitiful. Throughout the play, he gets humiliated by the two slaves who are supposed to help him as well as by his father, who will only allow the money to be given to his son, if he himself is allowed to spend a night with the girl.

(2)   *Philaenium: [...] sequere hac me, mi anime.*
        Argyrippus: **ego vero sequor**.
        'Follow me this way, my darling.—I'm following you indeed.' (Plautus,
        Asinaria 941)

The antecedent is a directive, requiring immediate movement. It is uttered by Philaenium, the object of his desire, and it prompts their exit from the stage. Philaenium, a courtesan, holds significant sway over the hopelessly enamoured youth, so his obediently following her is expected from this stock character. This example shows that the directive which triggers the echo response of compliance need not be uttered by a hierarchically higher character for the

response to count as submissive and it hints at the direction towards which our hypothesis will have to be modified. If the balance of power between the higher stock characters and the lower stock characters (such as master—slave) can be called static—both in standard and saturnalian scenes—then we now have to introduce the notion of dynamic power, which accounts for the power arising from specific conversational settings, plot developments, and individual characters. In this case, the youth is the submissive character, because being together with the object of his love is his main driving force in the play, and the echo response of compliance is, in this case, a linguistic marker of this dynamic. The example is, again, from the very end of the play—a memorable position, since these are the last words to be spoken by anyone before the whole troupe addresses the audience. There were other strategies available to Plautus, such as *fiat*, *licet*, or some other, non-conventionalized, response. The echo response of compliance was chosen because it temporarily places the youth into the ranks of the lower characters—as a *servus amoris*. The audience, accustomed to hearing this positive response strategy from the mouths of the slaves, must have appreciated this.

The other circumstance which has a significant impact on the youth in Roman comedy is the fact that he is the son of a typically domineering and grumpy or angry father. This introduces another variable of power: the power of a parent over a child. The following passage is from Terence's Andria, which features Pamphilus, who is in love with Glycerium, but his father Simo wants him to marry the neighbour's daughter Philumena. Simo's cunning slave Davus persuades Pamphilus that it is in his best interests to pretend to agree to the plan.

(3)   *Davus: ex ea re quid fiat vide.*

Pamphilus: ut ab illa excludar, hoc concludar.

Davus: non itast. nempe hoc sic esse opinor. Dicturum patrem "ducas volo

hodie uxorem;" tu "ducam" inquies. cedo quid iurgabit tecum?

'Consider the advantages.—I'll be shut out from her and shut in here.—Not so.

This is the situation as I see it. Your father will say "I want you to marry

today." You'll say "I shall." [152] Tell me, how can he quarrel with that?'

(Terence, *Andria* 385–9)

---

[152] For this discussion, I have modified the translation by replacing 'alright' with 'I shall'. I feel that the translation of *ducam* as 'alright' in Loeb's edition does not reproduce the sentiment; it is too light-hearted for the given conversational setting.

In this case, the relevant exchange between Simo and Pamphilus is imagined and reported by a slave. Reading the exchange on paper or on the screen, it is easy to forget that the words were originally performed. One can imagine that the actor onstage was not standing and relating his thoughts—he must have acted them out, imitating the pitch, body language, and linguistic mannerisms of the higher characters he was imitating. In this sense, reported dialogues, just like saturnalian scenes, may be considered linguistic sources of special value. If the comedy must, despite all the comic exaggeration, reflect the Roman society, then comedy within comedy must represent the comic Roman society: for Davus' imitation to ring true to the audience, he must have imitated the mannerisms and the language that the higher characters habitually used, as well as the dynamics of power between them. In this case, this was achieved by reproducing the father's wishes in the most peremptory form possible—with the verb *volo*. Barrios-Lech (2016: 107 and 247) argues that requests of the type *volo te facere/volo ut facias* 'I want you to do/I want that you do' carry a peremptory tone, a stronger one than a simple imperative. Donatus, too, characterizes the form as *nimis imperiosa et superba dictio*.[153] This shows that Terence put some thought into this theatre-within-theatre representations of the father–son relationship. It is therefore likely that the son's speech was purposefully rendered in such a way as to explicitly imitate what a dutiful son would say: with an echo response of compliance. Anything else would have sounded wrong to the Roman society—it would be a sign of filial disobedience—as well as to the comic Roman society—*fiat* is (and probably *licet* as well) reserved for other comic situations and other comic power balances.

As shown by Table 6.2b above, the statistical analysis of stock characters showed an anomaly: the matron in Plautus has a very high incidence of the echo response of compliance; higher, in fact, than the slave.[154] Since the matron is obviously not a lower character, another kind of explanation is necessary. In the analysis of the example (2), the notion of dynamic power was introduced, which accounted for the fact that the youth—a higher character—uses the echo response of compliance in response to a directive of a courtesan—a lower character. Since he is the submissive one in the conversational setting, he uses the language associated with lower characters. In the case of the matrons, however, this explanation does not work either, since the matrons are sometimes powerful and domineering characters, as for instance Cleostrata in *Casina*, Artemona in *Asinaria*, and Nausistrata in *Phormio*. Even though none of the three cases

---

[153] Donatus, *Ad Andriam* 418, quoted in Barrios-Lech 2016: 223.
[154] At the same time, the echo response of compliance is not attested in the matron of Terence—as shown in Section 6.3, Terentian matron uses *fiat*—a positive response strategy associated with higher characters.

are uttered by these, the submissiveness explanation surely cannot apply to them. While it is possible that this is simply a statistical noise due to the low token value (only three tokens), it will be useful to examine one of the relevant passages.

The following passage is from *Casina* by Plautus—the play where the matron Cleostrata consistently holds the upper hand over her philandering husband Lysidamus.

(4)   *Cleostrata: st! tace.*

      Myrrhina: quid est?

      Cleostrata: em!

      Myrrhina: quis est, quem vides?

      Cleostrata: vir eccum it. intro abi, appropera, age amabo.

      *Myrrhina: impetras, **abeo**.*

      'Hush! Be quiet.—What is it?—There!—Who is it, who can you see?—Look, my husband's coming. Go inside, be quick, come on, please.—Yes, yes, I'm going.' (Plautus, *Casina* 213–4)

In the exchange, two matrons of equal social status chat on the street in front of their houses. After a brief argument about how a woman should behave with her husband, Cleostrata sees her husband approaching and urges Myrrhina to remove herself before the husband could notice them speaking. Compared to the antecedents in this section we have encountered so far, this one is remarkably polite. The series of imperatives is softened by *amabo*, widely recognised as a politeness strategy.[155] Despite the urgency, which would, according to the traditional theories of politeness even allow the suspension of social niceties,[156] Cleostrata remains polite. The response, while obliging, can be explained neither by static not by dynamic submission: the two women are the same stock characters and there are clearly politeness strategies operating in the conversation, maintaining the balance of power (Watts 2003: 20).[157]

Explaining the case of the matron—acknowledged from the outset as anomalous—is going to be more challenging than the cases of the old man and the youth: the two women in the conversation belong to the same social class and the context does not suggest any dynamic power imbalance. The fact, however, that there are politeness strategies present implies

---

[155] E.g., Adams (1984); Dickey (2012).

[156] Brown and Levinson (1987: 69).

[157] Watts (2003) refers to these strategies as 'politic behaviour'; the distinction is not relevant for our discussion.

conscious effort to preserve the balance of power, so the notion of dynamic power remains relevant.

6.3 *Fiat*

Table 6.3a shows the results of the quantitative analysis of the social distribution of *fiat* in my corpus.

	Plautus		*Terence*	
	Tokens	1 occurrence per X lines	Tokens	1 occurrence per X lines
Higher characters	15	441.7	10	291.2
Lower characters	15	605.54	5	391.4

Table 6.3a

Table 6.3a shows that *fiat* is used more frequently by the higher characters than by the lower characters: in Plautus by the approximate factor of 1.37; in Terence by the approximate factor of 1.34. The difference is less drastic than in the case of the echo response of compliance (see Section 6.2). This suggests, albeit less definitely than in the case of the echo response of compliance, that *fiat* is a characteristic feature of the language of the higher characters. Keeping in mind the caveats about drawing conclusions about the language reality expressed in the previous section, in the case of *fiat*, there are even stronger grounds for avoiding such conclusions, because *fiat* is, to my knowledge, not attested in any other sources. In other words, there is no evidence that *fiat* occurs anywhere else than in Roman comedy, so hypotheses and conclusions formed here are applicable to the comic Roman society only.

Table 6.3b shows the distribution of *fiat* among stock characters.

	Plautus		*Terence*	

	Tokens	1 occurrence per X lines	Tokens	1 occurrence per X lines
Old man	9	364	5	330.7
Matron	1	523.7	2	96.2
Youth	5	549.5	3	354.9
Soldier	2	183.5		
Slave	4	1348.6	4	275.5
Maid	1	675.5		
Parasite	2	343.5	1	260.1
Courtesan	2	398.8		
Pimp	4	170.9		

Table 6.3b

In Plautus, it is again the lower characters with the low line counts which have the strongest incidence of *fiat*, this time the pimp, the soldier, and the parasite. Two of them belong to the category of socially anxious characters. Since the token values are low, these results will have to be backed up by the qualitative analysis before any conclusions can be drawn. Among the higher characters with high line counts, the old man, who has the highest token value, has the highest incidence. The slave, on the other hand, has a very low incidence—the lowest of all characters. While in Plautus, *fiat* is attested in all the stock characters, it is more limited in Terence, which can probably be explained by the fact that his comedy is centred less on stock characters and more on family relationships. In Terence, it is the matron which has the highest incidence, but again a low token value. Among the characters with high line counts, slaves have a higher incidence than old men.

Even though the high incidence of *fiat* in the lower characters with low line counts must be explained, the highest incidence in old men—together with the highest token value—seems to back up the conclusion that *fiat* is a characteristic feature of the language of the higher

characters. At the very least, the extremely low incidence in slaves—stock characters with a high line count—indicates that it is not characteristic of the lower characters.

While the low incidence of *fiat* in the Terentian old man requires explanation, the high incidence in the matron is in line with the hypothesis that *fiat* is a characteristic feature of the language of the higher characters. My assumption is that if a linguistic form shows a high presence in higher characters, it indicates that it counts as a prestigious form. Adams, in his article on feminine speech in comedy (1984: 44), cites Crassus in Cicero's *De oratore* 3.45 and Juvenal 6.449 as evidence that women (apparently in general) tend to favour prestigious or conservative forms of a language.[158] Thus both the old men (Maltby 1979) and the matrons are associated with prestigious linguistic forms.

The presence of *fiat* in lower characters does not by itself invalidate the hypothesis that *fiat* is characteristic of the higher characters, but since they represent anomalies in the data, it will be useful to try to explain them. While in the case of the echo response of compliance, only the data concerning the matron were anomalous, in this case there are more:

- The high incidence of *fiat* in the Plautine lower characters with low line counts;
- Higher incidence of *fiat* in slaves than old men in Terence;
- A high incidence in Terentian matrons, but not in Plautine.

I shall therefore start with an analysis of several instances of *fiat* in lower characters in both Plautus and Terence, to see whether the reasons for the anomalies can be explained by other factors, perhaps similar to the ones in the previous section—saturnalian scenes and power dynamics. I will also analyse the use of *fiat* in the matrons.

I start with a passage from Plautus' *Rudens*. It features the old man Daemones, the slave Gripus, and the pimp Labrax. Daemones, who, throughout the play, shows himself to be a decent master and a good person, is helped by Gripus to get his long-lost daughter back. The scene is from the very end of the play, after Daemones, in the presence of Gripus, has secured a financial deal with Labrax.

(5)   *Daemones: hic hodie cenato, leno.*
        Labrax: **fiat***, condicio placet.*

---

[158] *Facilius … incorruptam antiquitatem conservant. Eam sic audio, ut Plautum mihi aut Naeuium videar audire, sono ipso vocis ita recto et simplici est, ut nihil ostentationis aut imitationis adferre videatur* (Cicero, *De oratore* 3.45).

Daemones: sequimini intro. spectatores, vos quoque ad cenam vocem, ni daturus nil sim nec sit quicquam pollucti domi, nive adeo vocatos credam vos esse ad cenam foras. verum si voletis plausum fabulae huic clarum dare, comissatum omnes venitote ad me ad annos sedecim. vos hic hodie cenatote ambo.

*Labrax et Gripus: **fiat**.*

Daemones: plausum date.

'Have dinner here today, pimp.—Yes, I like the invitation.—Follow me in, you two. Spectators, I'd also invite you to dinner, were it not for the fact that I'm not going to give any and that I don't have any meal at home, and were it1420 not for the fact that I believe you've been invited out for dinner. But if you want to give this play your loud applause, you can all come for drinks at my place in sixteen years' time. Both of you, dine here today.—Yes.—Give us your applause.' (Plautus, *Rudens* 1416–23)

The passage features two instances of *fiat* (or three, since the second instance is uttered at the same time by two characters), both uttered by lower characters—the pimp Labrax and the slave Gripus. In both cases, the antecedent is an invitation. First, Daemones invites Labrax to dine with him, using the Early Latin imperative *cenato* which gives the exchange an official, cold tone, reminiscent of ancient legal language (Maltby 1979: 144).[159] It fits in well with the atmosphere of the business deal that was just concluded and may have had the effect of giving the rest of the conversation official overtones. The old man uses the Early Latin imperative throughout the play, which adds an archaizing tone to his idiolect (*ibid.*).

Labrax responds with *fiat, condicio placet*. As shown by Table 6.3b, *fiat* is only given to pimps four times in the whole Plautine corpus and never in Terentian. This means that the audience was not used to hearing *fiat* from a pimp. Since the pimp was favourably disposed towards Daemones because of the business deal and has, additionally, just been invited to dine with him as an equal, he may have felt it appropriate to upgrade his language to fit the occasion. In the very last line of the play, Daemones extends his invitation, again with the Early Latin imperative, to include his slave Gripus, thereby showing him that he had just been freed, as slaves are usually not allowed to eat with their masters. Both Labrax and Gripus utter with one voice what must have been a loud and enthusiastic *fiat*. Gripus' circumstances had just been

---

[159] *Si nox furtum faxit, si im occisit, iure caesus esto* (*Lex XII Tab.* 8.12, quoted from Maltby 1979).

permanently changed and it is only fitting that he elevate his language to match his new social status. In the whole preserved Plautine corpus, *fiat* is only uttered four times by a slave as a positive response strategy (only every 1348.6 lines, as Table 6.3b shows), which means that the audience was not at all used to hearing it from a slave.

Another example of changing of one's speech pattern is Lorarius in Plautus' comedy *Captivi*. The words of Tyndarus in this scene have been examined by Barrios-Lech (2016: 235–48) who has shown that the slave Tyndarus, upon assuming the role of his master (by donning the costume), also assumes an idiom appropriate for a higher character: by employing frequent subordination, indirect structures, and padded phrasing. We, however, are interested in Lorarius and his idiom.

> (6)   *Tyndarus: unum exorare vos sinite nos.*
> *Lorarius: quidnam id est?*
> *Tyndarus: ut sine hisce arbitris atque vobis nobis detis locum loquendi.*
> *Lorarius: **fiat**. apscedite hinc: nos concedamus huc. sed brevem orationem incipisse.*
> 'Let us persuade you to do us one favor.—What's that?—Give us the opportunity to speak without being overheard by these people or by you.—All right. Go away from here. We should move here. But don't start a long talk.'
> (Plautus, *Captivi* 211–5)

This is one of the rare cases of a slave using *fiat* and seems indicative of his elevated position among slaves as a slave overseer: as the first among the slaves, he tries to speak the part, too. The antecedent is a polite request by Tyndarus (who is actually the young man Philocrates). Lorarius gives his assent by using *fiat*.[160] *Fiat* is a semantically appropriate form, as it indicates detachment and impersonality, associated with power old men tend to have. It is a salient form in the mouth of someone who is a slave and, moreover, a less important one: *lorarii* are usually nothing more than 'oafs', silently standing around (Barrios Lech 2016: 237, quoting Moore 1998: 192). The saliency is further underlined by Lorarius' use of parataxis, characteristic of speakers with less education, with which he betrays his real stock position (Clackson 2011:

---

[160] His other options would be to use the echo response, *faciam* or *licet*. The simple echo response (one would expect this to be *do* or *do locum*) would not have been metrically convenient; *licet*—which, ironically enough, probably arose from exactly this type of behaviour, would not have been appropriate, because it is, as suggested in Section 5.2.5 of Chapter 5, likely a feature of the idiom of the lower characters.

524). This creates a comic effect of someone trying to sound more sophisticated than the audience knows them to be.

The term 'linguistic adaptation' is well known in sociolinguistics. It designates an individual's use of language to signal group membership: either to advance their social position by adopting the speech of the elite (overt prestige) or gain favour of a non-elite group of people (covert prestige).[161] Examples of seeking both covert and overt prestige are documented in Latin. Plautus, Terence, and Petronius, some of our main sources for sociolinguistic research in Latin, display awareness of language as a signal of group membership as well. Anecdotes exist on the Emperor Augustus' impatience with the precepts of grammarians, which may suggest deliberate downgrading of his language to seek popularity with the people (Clackson 2011: 507). The examples (5) and (6) above represent low status characters adopting the more prestigious language variety to signal group membership: Labrax and Gripus attempt to sound more like the old man Daemones, who is inviting them to dinner, to show that they are worthy of dining with their betters, while Lorarius tries to dissociate himself from other slaves to show off the prestige of being their superior.

The second anomaly which needs to be addressed is the higher incidence of *fiat* in slaves than in old men. Since two pieces of evidence (statistical data from Plautus and the cases of language adaptation, which are not limited to the examples discussed above) are pointing towards the idea that *fiat* was indeed a characteristic feature of higher characters in Plautus, the hypothesis is probably not incorrect. It is also unlikely that Terence would drop *fiat* as a characteristic sign of old men's idiolect; thus, it is safe to assume that it is the Terentian slave which must have an ulterior motive for using *fiat*, not the old man.

An examination of all five occurrences of *fiat* in old men in terms of relationships between the speakers confirms that. In three cases, the old man has authority over the addressee: in one example, the youth Pamphilus asks his father Simo to unchain their slave;[162] in another, the old man is told by a slave what the course of action should be;[163] in the third example, a father is asked by his son to forgive the slave, who was acting on his behalf.[164] In the remaining two

---

[161] Trudgill's (1974) research into Norwich social variation discovered that men were likely to opt for non-standard forms, associated with virility and toughness, thus seeking covert prestige. In the case of overt prestige, the most famous studies are still those of William Labov (1966) on the pronunciation of /r/, conducted in department stores in downtown New York.

[162] Terence, *Andria* 956.

[163] Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 593.

[164] Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 1066.

cases, the speaker has some authority (the antecedents to the response are uttered at the same time by the speaker's son and by the speaker's brother)[165]—or no authority (the two speakers are both old men and therefore equal).[166]

As for *fiat* in Terentian slaves, there are four occurrences. In all cases, a slave is using it in response to an antecedent by a higher character. Two cases are realised by *fiat* and two by *fiet* (these are uttered one after another in the course of one conversation).

Both instances of *fiat* in Terence are atypical. The following exchange is between Chremes and his slave Syrus. Syrus proposes a trick for Chremes to get his way, but Chremes disagrees with the way in which it is supposed to be carried out.

(7)   *Chremes: atqui quam maxume volo te dare operam ut fiat, verum alia via.*
        Syrus: **fiat***, quaeratur aliquid.*
        'Admittedly, I am very keen that you should bring it off, but in some other
        way.—All right.' (Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 788–90)

The antecedent is a directive that the desired state of affairs be brought about in some other way. From a dutiful slave, one would expect an echo response of compliance. Syrus, however, is not such. He is insolent towards Chremes and it is Chremes himself who is to be the victim of the very trick they are talking about. Syrus responds by *fiat, quaeratur aliquid*. This choice of this response reflects his attitude in several ways. First of all, both parts of the answer are impersonal, implying limited responsibility on the part of the speaker and allowing him to escape commitment. *Fiat* conveys authoritative approval, rather than assures. Its impersonality may, indeed, be one of the reasons, why *fiat* has become a conventional confirmation strategy of old men. Similarly, in the second part, he does not use future tense—*quaeretur aliquid*—which would imply commitment, but opts for a subjunctive—*quaeratur aliquid*—which only acknowledges the need that some other solution be found, without any commitment on his part. Secondly, the fact that he mockingly appropriates the speech of old men, is an even stronger statement, which escapes Chremes, but probably did not escape audiences. The joke results from this *double entendre*: Chremes seems to be under the impression that he got a positive response from an obedient slave, while the audience sees the situation for what it is: a slave,

---

[165] Terence, *Adelphoe* 945.
[166] Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 948.

duping his master with his scheming, as well as by challenging his social position by the choice of language.

The following exchange is from Terence's *Adelphoe*. The youth Ctesipho and the slave Syrus enter the scene. Ctesipho explains that he is reluctant to come across his father.

(8)   *Syrus: apud villamst. nunc quom maxume operis aliquid facere credo.*
       Ctesipho: utinam quidem! quod cum salute eius fiat, ita se defetigarit velim ut triduo hoc perpetuo prorsum e lecto nequeat surgere.
       *Syrus: **ita fiat**, et istoc si qui potis est rectius.*
       'He's at the farmhouse. I expect he's working on some job this very minute.—I only hope he is. As long as he doesn't come to any harm, I'd like him to get himself so exhausted that for the next three days he can't get out of bed at all.—Yes indeed, and an even better fate than that if possible. (Terence, *Adelphoe* 517–21)

This case is atypical in terms of the antecedent as well as the response. As opposed to most other examples, where the antecedent is a directive, the antecedent is an expression of wish by the youth Ctesipho: the wish that his father stay in bed for a the next three days. Most responses to future action antecedents in this study are uttered to communicate the readiness to carry out the desired state of affairs. Since the desired state of affairs is not in anyone's power to effect, all that Syrus can do is to echo the wish of Ctesipho. In other words, this is not an agreement to do something, but rather an evaluation of someone's wish. *Ita fiat* does not seem to fall under positive responses to future antecedents at all. This case, technically, has to do with a future state of affairs and is thus clearly a borderline case between positive responses to information antecedents and positive responses to action antecedents. The case ending up here is a consequence of the decision to categorise positive response strategies based on antecedents and the fact that the antecedent of expression of wish belongs to a future state of affairs, albeit uncontrollable ones. The boundaries between antecedents, however, are always fuzzy and I do not claim absolute correctness in this decision: it might turn out that the better parameters would be 'controllable vs. uncontrollable', in which case this example clearly would not belong in the chapter with directives.

The case, however, highlights an important issue. The fact is that Syrus (who, one should mention, is not the same Syrus as in (7)), is not responding to a directive—his freedom of action is not infringed upon, so no strategy is necessary to either show deference with the echo

response of compliance or to show impersonal nonchalance with *fiat*. In other words, his choice of *fiat* is neither socially nor functionally motivated. This brings up an important question: on what basis is *fiat*—or any other word or expression—chosen as a language characterization strategy: on the basis of form or function? To put it another way, is the word *fiat* a marker of old man speech in any context, as long as it appears in a response, or is it a marker of old men's speech only in contexts where power dynamics and social relationships are at stake—in which case it is not the word that is the marker, but rather what the word does, that is, show nonchalance, non-commitment, and detachment of a higher character? Most other language characterisation strategies found in literature are formal, but still have an underlying reason: slaves, characterized by using Greek words (see Maltby 1995) probably reflect the eastward expansion of the Roman Empire which prompted a large influx of Greek speaking slaves (Clackson 2011: 515); lower characters using parataxis instead of complex subordination may reflect the speech of lower classes (Clackson 2011: 524, Barrios-Lech 2016: 341, note 24; also Cabrillana 2004: 16); old men in the Roman comedy using archaisms (Maltby 1979) may reflect the conservatism typically associated with old people.

The issue of functional language characterization has already been recognized in Maltby (1979: 143) who discussed it under the heading 'Words Linked Semantically with the Role of Old Men in the Plot'. Recognizing that in the case of archaisms and long-winded expressions, it was the *form* which made them appropriate for old men, he observed that 'there are cases where the *meaning* of a word explains its restrictions to one sort of character, because it fits in with some specific aspect of the character's behaviour.' As examples he cites, e.g., the use of diminutives referring to persons (such as *muliercula* or *adulescentulus*), the use of imperative *ades*, explaining that the reason is probably 'behavioural' [quotation marks in the original], since old men are more likely to be ordering other people around (Maltby 1979: 143–5). The reason for the old men to use *fiat* is probably in the same category as *ades*, that is, 'behavioural': the old men are less likely to show deference to the co-interactant with an echo response of compliance—if they do, there is usually a special reason, as we have seen above—and more likely to make an authoritative pronouncement with *fiat*. Thus, *fiat* is a language characterization strategy by virtue of its function in the character's discourse—to paint him as assertive—not by its mere presence. This means that *fiat* is a language characterization strategy only in contexts where dynamic power is at stake. The example (8) is then a statistical noise, arising from the fact that *fiat* can appear in positive responses which have nothing to do with

dynamic power; it is thus not in contradiction with the hypothesis, formed on statistical grounds, that *fiat* characterizes higher characters.[167]

The difference between the language characterization on formal grounds and the language characterization on functional grounds potentially has wider implications, touching on the role of the author in the creation of the text. The question is mentioned by Adams (1984), when he discusses the difference between how women spoke and how women were stereotypically expected to speak—which translates to the question, whether the language of the comedy draws on real society or on stereotypical expectations of the (predominantly educated male) authors.

The idea is that if a language characterization strategy is found to be formal, there is a likelihood that it ended up in the texts as a result of what one may call authorial intervention: the author held a stereotype on how women spoke and infused the text with expressions which conformed to the stereotype. In the case of women, this would be politeness strategies and emotional expressions (Adams 1984, criticized by Dutsch 2008). In the case of old people, this would be long-windedness and archaic expressions (Maltby 1979). If a language characterization is found to be functional, on the other hand, it is less likely to reflect authorial intervention and more likely to reflect organic development, because what is expected in a particular context translates to pragmatic competence in a language community and pragmatic competence is not a creation of one person (the author). In other words, infusing the text with stereotypes is optional, whereas respecting pragmatic norms of a language community is not.

Fiat is a language characterization strategy on functional grounds, which means that the context dictates its use, and not authors' views on how a speaker is supposed to behave. The example (8) shows that *fiat* in the mouth of a slave in the inappropriate context does not work as a language characterization strategy and it does not invalidate the cases where it does. This idea is supported by the fact that *fiat* shows dispersion in all strata of society and in both genders—reminiscent of real-world situations—as we will see in the following paragraphs.

The last case discussed above allowed us to introduce the functional (or, in Maltby's terms, semantic) criterion into the analysis. This might help to shed light on the last anomaly: the high incidence of *fiat* in Terentian matrons, as opposed to Plautine. For the functional criterion to come into play in the case of Terentian matrons, they would have to share behavioural or

---

[167] For the purposes of economy and since there is no need to 'explain away' all the atypical cases for the hypothesis to be valid, I refrain from discussing two cases of *fiet*, both uttered by the slave Parmeno in Terence's *Eunuchus* 208.

character traits associated with old men, such as conservatism and dominance. In the relevant conversations, the dynamic power should be on their side. Since the matrons in Terence only use *fiat* as a positive response strategy three times, let us see what those three cases have in common.

The first case is from *Hecyra*. Sostrata, the mother-in-law, is a dignified matron who has been unjustly accused of driving Pamphilus' wife away. Throughout the play, she shows herself to be steadfast and wise, putting the needs of her son before her own by removing herself to the countryside so as not to be the reason for the trouble in the young couple's marriage. In the exchange below, she is inquiring about her daughter-in-law's health, after which her son rushes her off into the house to remain onstage alone.

> (9)   *Sostrata: quid fuit tumulti? dic mihi. an dolor repente invasit?*
> *Pamphilus: ita factumst.*
> *Sostrata: quid morbist?*
> *Pamphilus: febris.*
> *Sostrata: cotidiana?*
> *Pamphilus: ita aiunt. i sodes intro. consequar iam te, mea mater.*
> *Sostrata:* **fiat**.
> 'What was the commotion about? Tell me, did she have a sudden attack of pain?—Yes, that was it.—What sort of illness is it?—A fever.—A mild one?—So they say. But go back inside, if you will, mother dear. I'll follow in a moment.—All right. (Terence, *Hecyra* 356–8)

The antecedent is a very frequently occurring exit directive, requiring immediate movement. The exit directive is most often followed by an echo response of compliance—mostly by lower characters or by a not very assertive, or very bright, youth. Sostrata, however, is neither a lower character nor lacking in dignity and wisdom. She responds by *fiat*. While an exit directive may frequently be prompted by requirements of stage management (See Section 4.3.2 in Chapter 4) and not necessarily by any power play, it is important that she uses *fiat*, associated with prestige, thus setting herself apart from lower characters which use an echo response of compliance when ushered offstage. This careful retention of dignity is perhaps reinforced by the fact that the one initiating the exit, her son, adds *sequar iam te*, and thus contributes to preserving the appropriate hierarchy (customarily, *sequor* is uttered by the responder, not the asker).

212

The other occurrence of *fiat* in a Terentian matron is found in Phormio, again after an exit directive and uttered by an equally sympathetic and strong Nausistrata, who holds sway over her husband with her dowry:

(10)   *Demipho: eamus intro hinc.*

         Nausistrata: **fiat**.

         'Let's go inside.—All right.' (Terence, *Phormio* 1054)

To these examples can be adduced the only Plautine use of *fiat* by a matron, uttered by Alcumena in Amphitruo, who, it is worth recalling, is independent enough to demand divorce when she thinks that she is being swindled by her husband Amphitruo:

(11)   *Alcumena: vin proferri pateram?*

         Amphitruo: proferri volo.

         Alcumena: **fiat**.

         'Do you want the bowl to be produced?—Yes, I do—Very well.' (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 769–70)

One can usefully compare these strong matrons to the nameless matron in Plautus' *Menaechmi*, whose domestic situation could not be more different—she refers to herself as *mulier misera* 'a wretched woman'.[168] She is rushed offstage to avoid getting beaten up by her husband. Appropriately, she uses the echo response of compliance:

(12)   *Senex: fuge domum quantum potest, ne hic te optundat.*

         Matrona: **fugio** […].

         'Run off home as fast as possible so that he doesn't beat you.—Yes.' (Plautus, *Menaechmi* 850–1)

It is perhaps no coincidence that the social position of the first three matrons who use *fiat* is so different from the nameless matron who uses the echo response of compliance. It is probably relevant, too, that Maltby, focussing only on Terentian matrons, observes several archaising features in Sostrata, such as the use of the probably archaic *satias* instead of classic *satietas* (1979: 136–7). The examples above indicate that the use of *fiat* can be added to the list, not as an archaising feature, but as a feature of dynamic power in conversation. The first three matrons share that power, but not the nameless matron in *Menaechmi*.

---

[168] Plautus, *Menaechmi* 614.

6.4 Conclusion

Table 6.2a showed the distribution of the echo response of compliance among social classes (which in this study translates to higher and lower characters) in the Roman comedy. The results show that the echo response of compliance has a significantly higher incidence among the lower characters, both in Plautus and Terence. This permitted us to formulate the initial hypothesis that the echo response is a feature of the language of the lower characters. Table 6.2b showed the distribution of the echo response of compliance among the stock characters. This allowed us to form a more fine-grained picture. It was revealed that the lower characters with the low line counts are especially likely to use the echo response of compliance and that the matron, despite being a higher character, shows a high incidence of the echo response of compliance. It is important to note that the echo response of compliance is used by all or nearly all characters, reflecting a realistic state of affairs in any language, ancient or modern: a variable, identified as typical for one social group, tends to be to different extents present in all social groups.

The statistical results based on one parameter, while tempting, were never intended to provide a definite answer and it was not expected they would explain all the data in the corpus. They did, however, provide a starting point, on which to attach further parameters. Analysing 'outlier examples' in the character of the old man took account of the phenomenon of ritualistic reversal of roles, very frequent in Roman comedy.[169] Discussing the passage featuring the youth allowed us to introduce the notion of dynamic power as well as the important variable of father-son relationship. The case of the matron in (4) can probably be explained in terms of politeness strategies.

Table 6.3a showed the distribution of *fiat* among social classes in Roman comedy. It shows that *fiat* has a higher incidence in higher characters than in lower characters, both in Plautus and Terence. This allowed us to formulate an initial hypothesis that *fiat* is a characteristic feature of higher characters. Table 6.3b showed the distribution of *fiat* among the stock characters. Unlike in the section on the echo response of compliance, however, the distribution among the stock characters did not straightforwardly reflect the hypothesis. As in the previous section, the statistical part was just a part of the story which needed to be complemented by a qualitative analysis. There were three issues that needed explanation: the high incidence of *fiat* in Plautine

---

[169] See Segal (1987: 99–136) for a more detailed discussion on saturnalian scenes.

lower characters with low line counts; the incidence of *fiat* which is higher in the slaves than in the old men in Terence; a high incidence in the Terentian matron, but not in the Plautine.

It was shown in two different passages that *fiat* is used by lower characters when they have a reason or a motivation to imitate the language of higher characters: a slave, who had just been freed, upgrades his language; a pimp, who was invited to dinner—that is, a free lower character—wanted to show that he has what it takes to dine with the nobles; in another case, an overseer of slaves tried to sound sophisticated, only to betray his status by the rest of his language.

Regarding the comparatively high incidence of *fiat* in Terentian slaves, it was shown that in one of the four cases, the slave again upgraded his language; however, this time the motivation was to mock his master. While this escaped the master, the audience were in on the joke, because—consciously or not—they felt that *fiat* is an aberration from the usual speech pattern of a slave.

In another case it was shown that *fiat* can appear in a positive response even when there is no identifiable future action which the responder is supposed to carry out. This illustrates the fuzzy boundaries of the antecedent categories set out in Section 3.4 of Chapter 3. The example, however, is important for this chapter, as it allowed us to introduce the functional criterion of language characterization: a word or an expression is a language characterization strategy by virtue of its function, not by its mere presence. In the case of *fiat*, we can conclude that *fiat* is a language characterization strategy in contexts where power dynamics is at stake and where *fiat* indicates 'behavioural traits', to use Maltby's (1979) expression. As observed by the same author, this is language characterization in a wider sense than has been discussed so far. It was argued that this might reflect organic development of a sociolinguistic situation, rather than authorial intervention based on stereotypes. Such a linguistic characterization is more likely to reflect real world situations, rather than an idea of how a stratum of society is supposed to speak.

The functional criterion also helped to shed light on the high incidence of *fiat* in the matrons. It was found that all cases in both authors where *fiat* is used by the matrons could be correlated with their behavioural traits or social standing. The example (4), where another strong matron, Myrrhina in *Casina*, uses the echo response of compliance, may suggest that the echo response of compliance could function as a politeness strategy.

The findings of the analysis of *fiat* complement those of the analysis of the echo response of compliance. In the case of socially anxious characters, it was found that they show a high incidence of both echo response of compliance and a high incidence of *fiat*. This could be explained by the fact that the echo response of compliance represents their baseline speech, whereas they only use *fiat* in special circumstances, such as for language adaptation or to mock the language of a higher character. A complementary situation was observable in old men: while they are more likely to use *fiat*, appropriate for their position in society, there are cases where they use the echo response of compliance, but mostly in special circumstances, such as power reversal.

The analyses above have shown that agreements to directives—that is, explicit acknowledgements of submission to the will of another person—in the corpus of Plautus and Terence can profitably be analysed in terms of their social distribution. Since the existence of the positive response of compliance was suggested based on the curious speech patterns of Plautine and Terentian stock characters, the conclusions are not extended to the Latin language in general. The same goes for *fiat*, which, to my knowledge, is not attested as a positive response strategy in any other source.

7 Conclusion and Venues for Future Research

In this study, I have attempted to describe the Latin positive response system based on selected positive response strategies. My principal aim was to identify pragmatic factors which condition the use of these strategies—to learn, in other words, why one positive response strategy is chosen over another. While the starting point was the question 'how to say *yes* in Latin', it soon turned out that 'saying yes' is not limited to the word *yes* and the basic environment of the polar question is not the only context where *yes* and other positive response strategies are used. In order to make the study valuable beyond Plautus and Terence and to be able to study the system underlying the artistic language of the playwrights, I have anchored my study in similar studies on positive response strategies in modern languages.

While, cross-linguistically, the repetition of the verb is the main realisation of the echo response, this was not obvious for Latin, mainly because of the fact that the comedies of Plautus and Terence are poetic creations which abound in repetition for aesthetic purposes. In many cases it is not easy to see whether the response is a realisation of the echo response as a neutral positive response strategy—the equivalent of *yes*—or of an aesthetic need for repetition. Indeed, in many cases, it is both. Even though the precise grammatical rules could not be formed, I have found that in many cases where anything other than the verb is echoed, pragmatic reasons could be identified. This means that the echo response in Latin corresponds to the cross-linguistic understanding of the echo response.

In general, the echo response and the positive response systems in particular languages deserve a closer scrutiny. The concept of the echo response, as I have shown, is not limited to repeating full verbs as in traditionally echo-based languages. It is a matter of degree and, as such, it is not limited to the geographical periphery of the European continent—British Isles, Brittany and Finland—but is present in many other languages. As mentioned in Potočnik (2023), the positive responses in the European linguistic area present an intriguing state of affairs, where the echo response system in Indo-European seems to have been replaced by particle-oriented systems relatively recently. The diversity of the positive response particles in Romance languages, noted in the quotation by Meillet at the beginning of this study, certainly suggests that genealogical factors do not play an important role here, so it should be interesting to study the role of language contact in this development. Studying the degrees of the echo response in individual languages and comparing contexts where one or the other is used, should produce interesting results.

The echo response broadly understood is in many cases also the source for the non-echo positive response strategies. It can be shown that positive response particles, such as *ita* and *sic*, ultimately start their development in the echo response—as substituted echo responses. It is when the substitution is not immediately traceable anymore, that one can speak of positive response particles. Both *ita* and *sic* must have crossed that threshold at some point. *Ita* shows signs of independence already in Plautus and Terence and was definitely emancipated by the time of Petronius. Regarding *sic*, the positive response particles of several Romance languages are thought to originate from it. The question has been posed whether its limited use in Plautus and Terence should be considered the beginning of that development. A definite response, however, would amount to speculation, especially due to the fact that the language of Plautus and Terence is not a faithful record of the language of the street—and the default context for positive response particles is certainly the street, rather than written documents.

Despite these limitations of the corpus, however, some aspects of the language of the street have made their way into Plautus and Terence in the form of principles of conversation. This is largely what we have in mind when we say that despite the artificial character, the conversation in Plautus and Terence must have elements of authentic conversation. This does not mean that nothing in the corpus is authentic, merely that the principles of conversation are harder to manipulate and thus represent more reliable evidence. In this sense, the instances where it is considered a turn-taking or a feedback strategy are of special importance, because these functions of *ita* are secondary to the function of responding positively to a question; without it, these functions could not develop at all. This strongly suggests that *ita* was an equivalent of *yes* already in the 3rd century BCE. On the other hand, the lack of *sic* in conversation management functions suggests that it was not an equivalent of *yes* in the spoken Latin of the period.

In terms of contribution to Latin linguistics, the results reported here should be considered a case study on the utility of literary sources in linguistic research. They should offer new perspectives on well-studied phenomena, such as repetition, and encourage further research. I hope to have shown that the development of positive response particles is an interesting area for studying processes of language change, such as conventionalisation and emancipation. The question, why an expression in one language develops into a positive response particle and an equivalent expression in another language does not, is for now open and can only be resolved once enough detailed studies are available.

The methods of studying positive response strategies were developed in such a way as to maximise their utility in linguistics in general. The parameters of research—the basic properties of the echo response and positive response particles—should be transferable and open to upgrading. The echo response and the potential positive response particles were described in such a way that they can be put side by side with results from similar studies on other languages. The study should thus contribute to the growing body of research on responses, an understudied area, and be useful in typological studies, for which detailed descriptions of phenomena in individual languages are indispensable.

Bibliography

Editions

Barsby, John, ed. 2001a. *Terence: Phormio; The Mother-in-Law; The Brothers*. Loeb Classical Library 23. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

———, ed. 2001b. *Terence: The Woman of Andros; The Self-Tormentor; The Eunuch*. Loeb Classical Library 22. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Freese, J. H. 1930. *Cicero: Pro Quinctio; Pro Roscio Amerino; Pro Roscio Comoedo; On the Agrarian Law*. Loeb Classical Library 240. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Leo, F., ed. 1895. *Plauti Comoediae. 2 Volumes*. Berlin.

Melo, Wolfgang de, ed. 2011a. *Plautus: Amphitryon; The Comedy of Asses; The Pot of Gold; The Two Bacchises; The Captives*. Loeb Classical Library 60. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

———, ed. 2011b. *Plautus: Casina; The Casket Comedy; Curculio; Epidicus; The Two Menaechmuses*. Loeb Classical Library 61. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

———, ed. 2011c. *Plautus: The Merchant; The Braggart Soldier; The Ghost; The Persian*. Loeb Classical Library 163. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

———, ed. 2012. *Plautus: The Little Carthaginian; Pseudolus; The Rope*. Loeb Classical Library 260. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

———, ed. 2013. *Plautus: Stichus; Trinummus; Truculentus; Tale of a Travelling Bag; Fragments*. Loeb Classical Library 328. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Radice, Betty, trans. 1969. *Pliny the Younger: Letters. Volume I: Books 1-7*. Loeb Classical

    Library 55. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Schmeling, Gareth, ed. 2020. *Petronius, Seneca: Satyricon; Apocolocyntosis*. Loeb Classical

    Library 15. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Thesaurus linguae Latinae editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque Germanicarum

    Berolinensis Gottingensis Lipsiensis Monacensis Vindobonensis. 1900ff. Leipzig: Teubner.

Wessner, Paul, ed. 1902. *Aeli Donati quod fertur commentum Terenti: Accedunt eugraphi*

    commentum et scholia Bembina. Leipzig.

References

Adams, J.N. 1984. 'Female Speech in Latin Comedy'. *Antichthon* 18 (1984): 43–77.

Allen, J. H., and J. B. Greenough. 1903. *New Latin Grammar*. Boston, London: Ginn and

    Company.

Allwood, Jens, Joakim Nivre, and Elisabeth Ahlsen. 1992. 'On the Semantics and Pragmatics of

    Linguistic Feedback'. *Journal of Semantics* 9 (1): 1–26.

Anderson, Andrew Runni. 1914. 'The Unity of the Enclitic Ne'. *Classical Philology* 9 (2): 174–

    88.

Armstrong, Meghan E. 2008. 'Pragmatic Restrictions on Affirmative Response Choice in

    Brazilian Portuguese'. In *Selected Proceedings of the 10th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*,

    288–99. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Austin, John. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Barrios-Lech, Peter. 2016. *Linguistic Interaction in Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bäuerle, Rainer. 1979. 'Questions and Answers'. In *Semantics from Different Points of View*, edited by Rainer Bäuerle, Urs Egli, and Arnim von Stechow, 61–74. Berlin: Springer.

Beach, Goodwin B. 1955. 'De Sermone Cotidiano'. *The Classical Journal* 50 (8): 355–59.

Berger, Łukasz. 2020a. 'Forms of Talk in Roman Comedy. Reading Plautus and Terence with Goffman and Conversation Analysts' XI: 137–67.

———. 2020b. 'Turn Taking and Power Relations in Plautus' Casina'. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 25: 19–35.

Brown, Paul H., Brian D. Joseph, and Rex E. Wallace. 2009. 'Questions and Answers'. In *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 1: Syntax of the Sentence*, edited by Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 489–530. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan. 2003. 'Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticization: The Role of Frequency'. In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 602–23. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Cabrillana, Concepción. 2004. 'Forma lingüística y tipo de personaje en la comedia Terenciana'. In *Registros linguisticos en las lenguas clásicas*, edited by Agustín Ramos Guerreira and Antonio López Eire, 11–31. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Christenson, David, ed. 2000. *Plautus: Amphitruo*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2019. 'Metatheatre'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Comedy*, edited by Martin T. Dinter, 136–50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clackson, James. 2011. 'The Social Dialects of Latin'. In *A Companion to the Latin Language*, edited by James Clackson, 503–26. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Clackson, James, and Geoffrey Horrocks. 2007. *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Malden, Mass., Oxford: Blackwell.

Dickey, Eleanor. 2012. 'How to Say "Please" in Classical Latin'. *The Classical Quarterly* 62 (2): 731–48.

———. 2015. 'How to Say "Please" in Post-Classical Latin: Fronto and the Importance of Archaism'. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 14 (1): 17–31.

Dickey, Eleanor, and Anna Chahoud, eds. 2010. *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dutsch, Dorota M. 2008. *Feminine Discourse in Roman Comedy*. Oxford University Press.

Fantham, Elaine. 2019. 'Family Finances'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Comedy*, 241–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferri, Rolando. 2012. 'How to Say No in Latin: Negative Turns, Politeness and Pragmatic Variation'. In *Variation and Change in Greek and Latin*, edited by Martti Leiwo, Hilla Halla-aho, and Marja Vierros, The Foundation of the finnish institute at Athens, 115–38. Helsinki.

Fortson IV, Benjamin W. 2008. *Language and Rhythm in Plautus: Synchronic and Diachronic Studies*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

Fraenkel, Eduard. 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grice, Paul. 1975. 'Logic and conversation'. In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, edited by P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Haffter, Heinz. 1934. *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Haiman, John. 1994. 'Ritualization and the Development of Language'. In *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*, edited by William Pagliuca, 3–28. John Benjamins.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1984. 'Language as Code and Language as Behaviour: A Systemic-Functional Interpretation of the Nature and Ontogenesis of Dialogue'. In *The Semiotics of Culture and Language. Volume 1: Language as Social Semiotic*, edited by Robin P. Fawcett, 3–35. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Halliday, Michael A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard. 2020. 'The Role of (Historical) Pragmatics in the Use of Response Particles. The Case of French'. *Functions of Language* 27 (3): 307–39.

Happ, Heinz. 1967. 'Die Lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus'. *Glotta* 45 (1): 60–104.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. 'The European Linguistic Area: Standard Average European'. In *Language Typology and Language Universals: An International Handbook*, edited by Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible, 2:1492–1510. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Haverkate, Henk. 1979. *Impositive Sentences in Spanish*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Heine, Bernd. 2002. 'On the Role of Context in Grammaticalization'. In *New Reflections on Grammaticalization 2*, edited by Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald, 83–101. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Herman, József, and Hannah Rosén, eds. 2003. 'Immo – Its Atypical Use in Petronius'. In
     Petroniana: Gedenkschrift für Hubert Petersmann, 169–81. Heidelberg: Winter.

Hofmann, Johann B., and A. Szantyr. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Munich: Beck.

Hofmann, Johann B. and Licinia Ricottilli. 2003. *La lingua d'uso Latina*. Bologna: Pàtron.

Holmberg, Anders. 2013. 'The Syntax of Answers to Polar Questions in English and Swedish'.
     Lingua 128: 31–50.

———. 2016. *The Syntax of Yes and No*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, Bob Morris. 1999. *The Welsh Answering System*. Trends in Linguistics, Studies and
     Monograph. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Joseph, Brian D. 2003. 'Evidentiality in Proto-Indo-European? Building a Case'. In *Proceedings
     of the Fourteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, 96–111. Washington, DC:
     Institute for the Study of Man.

Karakasis, Evangelos. 2005. *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge:
     Cambridge University Press.

———. 2013. 'Masters and Slaves'. In *A Companion to Terence*, edited by Antony Augoustakis,
     Ariana Traill, and John Thorburn, 211–22. Malden, Mass., Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2019. 'The Language of Roman Comedy'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Roman
     Comedy*, 151–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

König, Ekkehard, and Peter Siemund. 2007. 'Speech Act Distinctions in Grammar'. In *Language
     Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume I: Clause Structure*, edited by Timothy Shopen,
     276–324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kramer, Ruth, and Kyle Rawlins. 2011. 'Polarity Particles: An Ellipsis Account'. In *The Proceedings of the 39th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 39)*, edited by Suzi Lima, Kevin Mullin, and Brian Smith, 1:479–92. Amherst: GLSA.

Krifka, Manfred. 2013. 'Response Particles as Propositional Anaphors'. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 23: 1–18.

Kroon, Caroline. 1995. *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of Nam, Enim, Autem, Vero, and At*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology, v. 4. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

———. 1998. 'A Framework for the Description of Latin Discourse Markers'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30 (2): 205–23.

Kühner, Raphael, and Carl Stegmann. 1955. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Edited by Andreas Thierfelder. Dritte Auflage. Leverkusen: Gottschalk.

Labov, William. 2006. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Langacker, Ronald. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Magni, Elisabetta. 2009. 'Mood and Modality'. In *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax 2: Constituent Syntax*, edited by Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 193–275. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Maltby, Robert. 1976. 'A Comparative Study of the Language of Plautus and Terence'. Cambridge.

———. 1979. 'Linguistic Characterization of Old Men in Terence'. *Classical Philology* 74 (2): 136–47.

———. 1995. 'The Distribution of Greek Loan-Words in Plautus'. In *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, edited by R. Brock and A. J. Woodman, 8:31–69. Leeds.

Manuwald, Gesine. 2019. 'Plautus and Terence in Their Roman Contexts'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Comedy*, edited by Martin T. Dinter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, C. W. 2019. 'Stage Action in Roman Comedy'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Comedy*, edited by Martin T. Dinter, 87–100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, Kathleen. 2000. *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Meillet, Antoine. 1936. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale. Tome II*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Melo, Wolfgang de. 2011a. 'Introductory Note to Asinaria'. In *Plautus: Amphitryon; The Comedy of Asses; The Pot of Gold; The Two Bacchises; The Captives*, 133–39. Loeb Classical Library 60.

———, ed. 2011b. *Plautus: Amphitryon; The Comedy of Asses; The Pot of Gold; The Two Bacchises; The Captives*. Loeb Classical Library 60. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2011c. 'The Language of Roman Comedy'. In *A Companion to the Latin Language*, edited by James Clackson, 321–43. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Müller, Roman. 1997. *Sprechen und Sprache: Dialoglinguistische Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.

Norrick, Neal R. 1987. 'Functions of Repetition in Conversation'. *Text & Talk* 7: 245–64.

Palmer, Leonard Robert. 1954. *The Latin Language*. London: Faber and Faber.

Panchón, Federico. 1995. 'Sobre el valor de ita y sic en Plauto y Terencio'. In *IX Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Madrid, 27 al 30 de septiembre de 1995), Volumen III: Lingüística Latina*, edited by Antonio Alvar Ezquerra & Jesús García Fernández, 205–9. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos.

Penney, John. 2011. 'Archaic and Old Latin'. In *A Companion to the Latin Language*, edited by James Clackson, 220–35. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pinkster, Harm. 1972. *On Latin Adverbs*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Pinkster, Harm. 2015. *Oxford Latin Syntax*. Volume I: The Simple Clause. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pokorny, Julius. 1927. 'Das nicht-Indogermanische Substrat im Irischen'. *Zeitschrift für Celtische philologie* 16(1): 231–66.

Pope, Emily N. 1976. *Questions and Answers in English*. The Hague: Mouton.

Potočnik, Tomaž. 2023. 'Saying Yes without Yes: The Positive Response System in Latin'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 121 (1): 65–90.

Press, Ian. 1986. *A Grammar of Modern Breton*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.

Risselada, Rodie. 1993. *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language.* Leiden: Brill.

———. 1998. 'The Discourse Functions of Sane: Latin Marker of Agreement in Description, Interaction and Concession'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30 (2): 225–44.

———. 2021. 'Interactional Common Ground, Preference Structure and (Im)Politeness in Roman Comedy'. In *Linguisticae Dissertationes: Current Perspectives on Latin Grammar, Lexicon and Pragmatics*, edited by Antonio María Rodríguez Martín, 717–32. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

Roulet, Eddy, Antoine Auchlin, Jacques Moeschler, Christian Rubattel, and Marianne Schelling. 1985. *L'articulation du discours en français contemporain*. Lang. Bern.

Russel, Donald A., ed. 2002. *Quintilian: The Orator's Education. Volume IV: Books 9 – 10.* Loeb Classical Library 127. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation'. *Language* 50 (4).

Sadock, Jerrold, and Arnold Zwicky. 1985. 'Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax'. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Volume I, Clause Structure*, edited by Timothy Shopen, 155–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schachter, Paul, and Timothy Shopen. 2007. 'Parts-of-Speech Systems'. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume I: Clause Structure*, 1–60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1972. 'Sequencing in Conversational Openings'. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, edited by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 346–80. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis. Volume 1.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 100-6.

Schricx, Josine. 2011. *Lateinische Modalpartikeln*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Searle, John R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sedgwick, W. B. 1949. 'Plautine Chronology'. *American Journal of Philology* 70 (4): 376.

Segal, Erich. 1987. *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2001. *Responding in Conversation: A Study of Response Particles in Finnish*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tannen, Deborah. 2007. 'Repetition in Conversation: Toward a Poetics of Talk'. In *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, 48–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thesleff, Holger. 1960. *Yes and No in Plautus and Terence*. Helsingfors: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Trudgill, Peter. 1974. *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Väänänen, Veikko. 2006. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Vennemann, Theo. 2009. 'Celtic Influences in English? Yes and No'. *English Language and Linguistics* 13 (2): 309–34.

Wallage, Phillip, and Wim van der Wurff. 2013. 'On Saying "Yes" in Early Anglo-Saxon England'. *Anglo-Saxon England* 42: 183–215.

Watkins, Calvert. 1963. 'Preliminaries to a Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb'. *Celtica* 6: 1–49.

———. 1969. 'On the Prehistory of Celtic Verb Inflexion'. *Ériu* (21): 1–22.

Watts, Richard J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weiner, Susan L., and Donald R. Goodenough. 1977. 'A Move toward a Psychology of Conversation'. In *Discourse Production and Comprehension*, edited by Roy O. Freedle, 213–25. Norwood: Ablex.

Zerbino, Maria Cristina. 2013. 'Taceo in Plauto: quando dire non è fare'. *Rationes Rerum* 1: 115–47.